DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 736 95 SP 010 449

AUTHOR Brandt, Richard M.; And Others
TITLE Cultural Pluralism and Social Change. A Collection of Position Papers. ISTE Report V.
INSTITUTION National Center for Education Statistics (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 189p.; For related documents, see SP 010 446-448

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Communications; Community Involvement; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Factors; *Cultural Pluralism; Individual Differences; *Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Models; *Social Change; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Study

ABSTRACT

The eight papers in the report are tied together by the theme of pluralism and social change in an attempt to determine information needs in the area of inservice teacher education (ISTE) and to identify the contemporary issues surrounding ISTE. The first three papers describe case studies of substantial efforts in inservice education: a thirty-year child study movement devoted to the proposition that there are enormous individual differences among children which can be fully appreciated only in the content of each child's total personality; the Urban/Rural Program efforts to generate community-oriented inservice teacher training programs; and the attempt of Montgomery County, Maryland, public schools to mount a comprehensive teacher education program that would represent the needs both of the district and of individual teachers. Two papers address the future: a description of alternative conceptions and definitions of inservice teacher education and suggested languages which would permit us to talk coherently with one another using a wide variety of concepts; and a speculation on the meaning of general cultural change. Three papers explore multicultural education. (JMM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED129736

REPORT V

Cultural Pluralism and Social Change

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Brandt • Mesa • Nelson • Marsh
Rubin • Ashworth • Brizzi • Whiteman
Joyce • Howey • Boyer • with Vance

ISTE

REPORT V

Cultural Pluralism and Social Change

A Collection of Position Papers

Richard M. Brandt
University of Virginia

Richard P. Mesa
Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

Marilyn Nelson
Montgomery County, Maryland Public Schools

David D. Marsh
University of Southern California

Louis J. Rubin
University of Illinois, Urbana

Margaret C. Ashworth
Wayne State University

Elsa N. Brizzi
University of Southern California

Henrietta V. Whiteman
University of Montana, Missoula

Bruce R. Joyce
Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

Kenneth R. Howey
University of Minnesota

James Boyer
Kansas State University

with **Barbara A. Vance**
Wayne State University

June 1976

Palo Alto, California

The Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Project was sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics and the Teacher Corps.

Funds were administered and interviews conducted by the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers at:

University of Southern California	William C. Hill, Director
University of Nebraska, Omaha	Floyd T. Waterman, Director
Wayne State University	Barbara A. Vance, Director
Howard University	Donald W. Parker, Director
University of Georgia	Michael G. Baker, Director

The project was coordinated by:

Bruce R. Joyce	Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching
Lucy F. Peck	Hofstra University

The views presented are the responsibility of the project staff and are not necessarily the opinions of the funding agencies.

Project Monitors:

Shirley A. Steele	National Center for Education Statistics
Velma J. Robinson	Teacher Corps

Chief Administrators of the agencies:

Marie D. Eldridge	National Center for Education Statistics
William L. Smith	Teacher Corps

CONTENTS

Project Personnel: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching x

Project Personnel: Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers xi

States in which Interviews Were Conducted xii

History and Structure of the ISTE Project xiii

Introduction xvii

PART ONE: CASE STUDIES OF LARGE-SCALE PROGRAMS 1

CASE STUDIES OF LARGE-SCALE PROGRAMS: PERSISTENT ISSUES, Bruce R. Joyce 2

The Child Study Movement 3

The Urban/Rural Experience 5

The Montgomery County Experience 6

Issues 7

THE CHILD STUDY MOVEMENT, Richard M. Brandt 10

Nature of the Program 10

Origins and Early Development 11

The Uniqueness of Child Study 15

Interdisciplinary Nature 15

Independence from Expert Advice 16

The Use of Scientific Methodology in Record Analysis 17

The Influence of Group Dynamics and Informal Communications 21

Ethical Concerns in the Study of Children 23

Focus on Indivuals 24

De-emphasis on Extensive Rewards in the Learning Process 25

A Broadened Perspective of Relevant Content 25
Dissemination Rather than Research Priority 26
Organizational Patterns 27
School District Patterns 27
University Patterns 28
Consultant Roles 30
Fiscal Support 32
Spread of the Movement 32
Geographical and Historical Trends 32
Table 1: Summary of Field Services 33
Parent Groups, Agricultural Extension Agents, and Other Non-school Groups 34
Textbooks and College Courses 36
Procedural Stability and Change 37
Effectiveness of Child Study as a Change Agent 38
Durability and Spread Indications 38
Formal Evaluation Studies 39
A Hindsight Critique by a Former Insider 42
Significance and Lasting Effects 42
Reasons for Decline 44
Lessons for Future Staff Development Programs
References 51

IMPLICATIONS FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION OF THE URBAN/RURAL SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EXPERIENCE, Richard P. Mesa 53
Parity in Decision-making between School and Community in the Governance of the Urban/Rural Program 54
Focus on Inservice Education of Staff 58
An Advocate Leadership Training Institute 59
Great Flexibility within a Broad Category of Need 60
What Has Been Learned from the Urban/Rural Experience that Relates to the Problems Posed by the Study of Inservice Education? 60
Have Teachers Been Receptive to the Training? 60
Figure 1: What Is the Present Impact of Urban/Rural at this Site on Teachers in Each of the Following Areas? 61

What Might Be a Working Definition of Inservice Education? 62

What Is the Urban/Rural Experience with Teacher Reluctance to Express Deficiencies and Ask for Training? 63

What Strategies and Mechanisms for Providing Inservice Education Have Emerged in Urban/Rural? 64

What Other Experience Does the Urban/Rural Program Have to Offer the Design of a National Strategy for Inservice Education? 66

Summary and Conclusions 68

CREATING ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES FOR THE IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS, Marilyn Nelson 71

Introduction 71

Criteria for Judging In-service Training Programs 71

Organizational Structures for Delivery of In-service Education 72

The Higher Education Model 72

Contemporary Topics Institutes 73

The Model of Commerce 74

The IHE-LEA Cooperative Model 75

The Systematic Corporate Model 75

In-service Programs for the Future 78

Illustration: Montgomery County In-service Courses, 1975 - 1976 80

PART TWO: THE FUTURE: DEFINITIONS AND NEEDS 85

THE FUTURE: EMERGENT DEFINITIONS AND SOCIAL NEEDS, Kenneth R. Howey 86

RE-EXAMINING THE DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION, David D. Marsh 89

Previous Definitions of In-Service Education 91

The Purposes of In-Service Education 94

In-service Education via Personnel Growth 94

In-service Education via Professional Development 95

In-service Education via Educational Improvement Activities 96
The Processes of In-service Education 96
A Label and a Definition for In-service Education 100
A Label for In-service Education 100
A Definition of In-service Education 103
Implications for Practice and Research 106
References 111

THE SOCIETAL FUTURE AND TEACHING, Louis J. Rubin 115

PART THREE: SOCIAL CONTEXTS 133

PROFESSIONALS IN THEIR SOCIAL CONTEXTS, James Boyer 134
Summary 136

HELPING TEACHERS ADJUST TO STUDENTS WHOSE BACKGROUNDS DIFFER FROM THEIR OWN, Margaret C. Ashworth 138
Summary 144
Reference Notes 146
Suggested Readings 147

A MULTICULTURAL SCHOOL: LESSONS FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION, Elsa N. Brizzi 148

AN IN-SERVICE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM AS IT RELATES TO NATIVE AMERICANS, Henrietta V. Whiteman 153
Introduction 153
Essential Teacher Competencies in an In-service Multi-cultural Training Program 155
Native American Teacher Competency Number One 155
Native American Teacher Competency Number Two 156
Native American Teacher Competency Number Three 158
Native American Teacher Competency Number Four 159
Native American Teacher Competency Number Five 161
Guidelines for Designing an In-service Training Program 163

Reference Notes 166

Appendix A: Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers 168

Appendix B: Project Consultant Interviewers 169

PROJECT PERSONNEL

STANFORD CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN TEACHING

Bruce R. Joyce	Project Coordinator
Lucy F. Peck Hofstra University	Project Coordinator
Terry J. Rice	Coordinator of Editing
Marilyn R. Harper	Coordinator of Finances and Final Reports
Kathleen M. McNair	Data Analyst
Richard Diaz University of Southern California	Data Analyst
Pamela H. David	Data Analyst
Kenneth R. Howey University of Minnesota	Consultant
Sam J. Yarger Syracuse University	Consultant
Louis J. Rubin University of Illinois	Consultant
Elinore R. Brown	Typist
Colette R. Childs	Typist

PI[illegible] PERSONNEL

TEACHER CORPS RECRUITMENT AND TECHNICAL RESOURCE CNETERS

WESTERN CENTER

William C. Hill	Director
Joseph Romo	Associate Director
Ramona Gordon	Office Manager
Judy English	Typist
Roxie Bagley	Recruiter

MIDWESTERN CENTER

Floyd T. Waterman	Director
Thomas Dean	Associate Director
Edna Alexander	Administrative Assistant

GREAT LAKES CENTER

Barbara A. Vance	Director
Wilbert Bledsoe	Associate Director
Elentine Bonner	Office Manager
Caroline Wallace	Secretary/Bookkeeper
Ruth Peach	Secretary
Karen Crawford	Secretary

NORTHEASTERN CENTER

Donald W. Parker	Director
Patricia Matthews	Associate Director
Shirley Jones	Chief Application Processor
Athea Rayo	Secretary
Carol Coy	Assistant
Marian Hankerson	Assistant

SOUTHEASTERN CENTER

Michael G. Baker	Director
Barbara Ogletree	Survey Coordinator
Roger Bryant	Technical Assistant
Linda Anderson	Secretary/Bookkeeper
Mary Davis	Secretary

STATES IN WHICH INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED

Alabama
Arizona
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexcio
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklaho
Oregon
Pennsylvania
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin

District of Columbia

HISTORY AND STRUCTURE OF THE ISTE PROJECT

In June of 1975, the National Center for Education Statistics, with the cooperation of the National Teacher Corps, made the decision to inaugurate a series of studies in inservice teacher education. The phase of the study which is reported in these monographs is that of conceptualization.

Three sources of data were consulted in order to build concepts about the structure of inservice teacher education. The first of these was the existing literature. The second source of data were the positions of experts about the nature of the primary issues involved in the reconceptualization of the area. The third source were the opinions of several categories of interested parties, including teachers, administrators of school districts, school board members, community members, congressional representatives, state department of education officials, and higher education administration and faculty, about the major issues involved in inservice teacher education and the alternative ways of approaching these issues.

There were two primary purposes of the study. The first was to determine the data needs in the area. This information is to be used as the base for a succession of studies to determine the facts about inservice teacher education, the alternative issues, and the alternative solutions to these issues. The second purpose of the study was to conceptualize the area in such a way that Teacher Corps could guide its activities more effectively in light of the facts and opinions of the field.

The inservice teacher education project was coordinated by Bruce Joyce of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching and Lucy Peck of Hofstra University. The staffs of the five Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers arranged for the interviews, managed budgetary matters, developed small conferences in important areas of inservice education, and contributed to the editing and publishing of the present reports.

This monograph is one of a series of five reports on the conceptualizing phase of the study of inservice teacher education. Following is an outline of the monographs:

Report I: Issues to Face

Bruce R. Joyce, Kenneth R. Howey, Sam J. Yarger, and the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Center Directors

Report II: Interviews: Perceptions of Professionals and Policy Makers

Bruce R. Joyce, Kathleen M. McNair, Richard Diaz, and Michael D. McKibbin
with Floyd T. Waterman and Michael G. Baker for the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers

Report III: The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education: An Analytic Review

Alexander M. Nicholson and Bruce R. Joyce
with Donald W. Parker and Floyd T. Waterman for the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers

Report IV: Creative Authority and Collaboration

A collection of position papers by Sam J. Yarger, James Boyer, Kenneth R. Howey, Marsha Weil, Ralph M. Pais, Winifred I. Warnat, Robert D. Bhaerman, Robert Luke, and David Darland
with introductions by Sam J. Yarger and Bruce R. Joyce
with William C. Hill for the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers

Report V: Cultural Pluralism and Social Change

A collection of position papers by Richard M. Brandt, Richard P. Mesa, Marilyn Nelson, David D. Marsh, Louis J. Rubin, Margaret C. Ashworth, Elsa N. Brizzi, and Henrietta V. Whiteman
with introductions by Bruce R. Joyce, Kenneth R. Howey, and James Boyer
with Barbara A. Vance for the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers

first report is a relatively short summary of the data needs in inservice education and the major issues identified from the literature, the interviews, and the position papers. The second report contains the results of the interviews with more than one thousand teachers, school administrators, higher education administrators and faculty, and others concerned with policy making in the inservice area. An analysis of the literature in the field is described in the third report, while in the fourth and fifth reports, shortened versions of position papers in several major areas are presented. In the fourth report the problems of collaboration are explored, and issues attendant to cultural pluralism and social change are examined in the fifth report.

INTRODUCTION

There are eight papers in this volume, tied together by the theme of pluralism and social change. Each of the papers was written to help us think about inservice teacher education, to determine information needs in the area, and to identify the contemporary issues surrounding ISTE.

The first three papers of the group describe case studies of substantial efforts in inservice education. In the first, Richard Brandt describes thirty years of the child study movement, which was devoted to the proposition that there are enormous individual differences among children which can be fully appreciated only in the context of each child's total personality. The child study movement helped conduct scientific inquiry into the children they teach, to apprehend their differences and generate the variety of educational approaches that is appropriate to children growing up in a society devoted to pluralism.

In the second paper, Pete Mesa describes the Urban/Rural Program, one of the largest federally-funded efforts to generate community-oriented inservice teacher training programs. The Urban/Rural Program has supported twenty-five community projects. Funds are channelled through school districts but controlled by councils made up not only of school district officials but also of teachers, students, and, above all, community members representing the particular needs of their local situations. The Urban/Rural Program is devoted to school reform through the medium of social parity--the establishment of a relatively equal part in decision-making for all those persons concerned with making their neighborhood schools more effective. It was believed that community members would be devoted to helping their children grow on their own terms--with pride--and to develop roots that reflect the nature of their particular local community.

In the third paper of this group, Marilyn Nelson describes an attempt by the Montgomery County, Maryland Public Schools to mount a comprehensive teacher education program that would represent the needs both of the district and of individual teachers. The district supports over three

hundred courses each year, offering to its teachers a wide range of options for self-development and for becoming more effective in their roles as teachers. The Montgomery County staff development program represents a "corporate" model--a systems approach to the creation of options. Nelson contrasts this model with other approaches which she believes are less effective.

The next two papers address the future. David Marsh describes alternative conceptions and definitions of inservice teacher education and suggests languages which would permit us to talk coherently with one another using a wide variety of concepts. A common language which supports diversity is an essential part of any profession's attempt to support pluralism with professional rigor. Louis Rubin looks into the future and speculates on the meaning of general cultural change, especially changes brought about by technology. He analyzes technology-induced change both for the education of teachers and in terms of curriculums for the children with whom teachers work. Rubin reminds us that the culture evolves partly through the development of its technology, and that technical and value changes require adjustments on the part of the major social institutions which nurture the young and provide the political and economic contexts in which we all live.

In the final three papers of this series, we explore multicultural education. Margaret Ashworth helps us examine the problems that each of us faces as we work with persons who are culturally different from ourselves. She helps us understand the cultural blinders which prevent us from reaching one another without imposing our cultural values to the point that they prevent us from making contact with the positive values that lie in the very fact of our individual and broad cultural differences. Elsa Brizzi describes a most interesting multicultural/bilingual center in a southern California school district and discusses the problems of helping teachers and aides drawn from the community work together to explore cultural pluralism directly. Henrietta Whiteman also explores cultural pluralism, but from the perspective of the Native American, helping us to understand the concepts which in the past caused us to eschew cultural differences and which we must shed in order to create a solid base for a multicultural yet stable society.

The issues identified by these eight authors can be summarized in a series of questions:

Brandt How can the power of the scholar be made available to the

teacher so that he can perceive more clearly the children he teaches and the options which are open to him? What is the place of the academician in teacher education, and what kinds of bridges need to be built so that academic scholarship can become readily available to teachers in a form which they can use in their daily work?

Mesa: How can community members, reflecting the needs of their local situation and their private aspirations, be made part of a comfortable decision-making process so that the perspectives of the local citizen and his love for his children can be a part of the day-to-day life of the school and the education of the teacher?

Nelson: How can school districts systematically plan programs which will reflect the wide variety of curricular needs which they generate, reflect the needs for competence of the practitioners whom they hire, and meet the individual differences among those practitioners? What are the best models for large-scale inservice programs that meet system and personal needs simultaneously?

Marsh: How can we create a common language that holds the prospect that individual teachers can grow on their own terms, and yet reveals the concepts of a profession which needs precise definition of skills, knowledges, and values and the alternative ways of learning these things?

Rubin: How can the culture of the school be created in such a way that teachers continuously study the evolving society and bring their knowledge of social change to bear on their teaching? What kinds of climates can be created to encourage teachers to inquire into the nature of social change and learn to utilize that knowledge in their daily work? How can teachers and others working with them learn to recreate the school continually, so as to reflect the evolutionary nature of society and reduce or eliminate the enormous cultural lag that educational institutions have traditionally reflected?

Ashworth: How can we overcome our personal fears as we work with others who are different from us and generate an education which capitalizes on the child as he is, puts the burden for teaching on us, and requires us to reach out to and blend with our students without requiring them to bend to our preferred styles of teaching?

Brizzi: What are the ways in which multicultural and bilingual

communities can be reinforced and unified by bringing the cultural and linguistic resources of the community together with the professional resources of the teacher? What should be the nature of multicultural centers in which children, teachers, and community members study their commonalities and their differences and learn to build the bridges which will maintain cultural diversity within a stable, negotiated context?

Whiteman: How can we reach beyond ourselves and our own personal histories to embrace with sincere warmth the possibilities and strengths of our many subcultures and fearlessly reach out to generate a pluralistic society, confident that pluralism will strengthen us and not reduce our solidarity?

For inservice education to reflect cultural pluralism and to move with social change (and indeed, help to generate it) it itself must be pluralistic. The challenge of these papers is to generate models of inservice education which reflect the pluralism of society. They urge us to define the competence necessary to create an education which will strengthen both cultural differences and the common bonds which enable those differences to capitalize on one another. These papers contain numerous values. They exhort us to generate a powerful, yet sensitive, profession. They ask us to be strong in conviction, but gentle and sensitive. They suggest that a model of inservice education built around concepts of pluralism and social change will have to embody those very concepts itself. They tell us that teachers need to be enabled to live and learn as much as to teach.

ISTE

REPORT V • PART ONE

Case Studies of Large-scale Programs

Joyce • Brandt • Mesa • Nelson

CASE STUDIES OF LARGE-SCALE PROGRAMS: PERSISTENT ISSUES

Bruce R. Joyce
Stanford Center for Research and
Development in Teaching

It is surprising how easy it is to overlook the existence of some really enormous inservice training enterprises. Yet, it appears clear that, despite the vast dissatisfaction with present inservice training efforts, there is in fact an enormous experience to draw on and learn from. In Los Angeles, for example, the public school system offers more than one thousand courses a year which are experienced by 25,000 to 30,000 teachers. Furthermore, most of these courses are taught by teachers and other members of the school system. The teachers of that same system also attend the courses of the seventeen colleges and universities which are located within the city limits.

While Los Angeles efforts are extensive indeed, there have been many other large-scale inservice training programs. (Presently more than 35,000 public school personnel and as many college faculty work as inservice instructors for more than one million teachers annually.) In the papers that follow we examine three programs of unusual interest. One is best described as a substantive thrust in inservice education. It is the "child study" movement which began in the early 1940's at the University of Chicago and which still exists. Offering university courses, institutes, and workshops for teachers and consultants to school systems, the child study movement has helped more than 70,000 teachers and administrators to study the children they work with and develop tools for examining their own behavior. The child study movement was based on the work of academic scholars and was characterized by the attempt to make the interdisciplinary study of child development available to the day-to-day practitioner.

The second case concerns the national "Urban/Rural" program. There are twenty-five sites stretched across the country in the Urban/Rural program,

each of them characterized by a community council which controls the funds provided in the USOE grants. The council includes a team manager, community members, school officials, representatives from institutions of higher education, and students. The thesis of Urban/Rural is that by increasing parity between community members and others concerned with the inservice teacher education process, a richer and more relevant community inservice teacher education program will be developed. The resulting improvement in teacher performance should increase pupil learning. Urban/Rural represents one of the most extensive national efforts to date in which members of the community have been given not only an important role in planning inservice training activities, but also (by virtue of the council's control of the contracted money) the power to enforce their decisions and influence others.

Finally, we examine the experience of the Montgomery County Public Schools, which includes a series of Washington, D. C. suburbs. The relatively wealthy Montgomery County Schools have more than 6,800 staff members who are offered about three hundred courses each year under the auspices of the district. It represents a corporate model of inservice education, contrasting with a series of competing models which are described briefly in the paper.

All three of the position papers which describe these cases were written by participants in the enterprises. Richard Brandt, presently Dean of Education at the University of Virginia, has been associated with the child study movement for more than twenty years. Pete Mesa has been the Director of the Leadership Training Institute at Stanford University, which has helped to provide technical assistance to Urban/Rural sites, for the past two years. Marilyn Nelson is the Associate Director of Staff Development for the Montgomery County Public Schools. Each of these persons was asked to act as an informant/analyst rather than as an "objective" observer and to try to help us understand what the case he or she is associated with offers to present considerations of inservice education.

THE CHILD STUDY MOVEMENT

It is clear that the child study movement was, by any standards, an enormous success. Scholars in human development at the University of Chicago had become concerned that many educational practioners did not have adequate contemporary tools for studying their students and that they might lack a basis for interpreting their own behavior or modifying it to create optimal educational

environments for the students with whom they were working. Gradually, case study techniques from the procedures employed by advanced scholars were modified into a form which teachers and school administrators could use to study their students. Most of the training was offered through university courses, although there were a considerable number of institutes, workshops, etc. over the years. The substance of courses revolved around case studies developed by the teachers. Thus, the children with whom the practitioners were working became the content of the courses and the scholars' techniques were being applied to the "real world" of the schools.

Brandt points out that the child study movement gradually declined in force as techniques became over-standardized, points of view became doctrinaire, and the cadre of trainees was dispersed. Nonetheless, it still touches the lives of several thousand teachers a year.

The history of the child study movement demonstrates the problem of enabling scholars to make a contribution to the practitioner. It also underlines what the scholar can offer. Brandt feels that its success depended on the development of techniques by which teachers could apply the methodology of scholarship to the benefit of children with whom they were working. This created a bridge between theory and practice which enabled the academic content to become more relevant to the needs of the teacher and students than was usually the case in psychology and child study courses. This experience suggests that the creation of many such bridges might help span the gulf between the professors' scholarship and teachers' needs. Making direct application of scientific concepts and bringing the professor into closer contact with the nature of the children in the situations where the practitioner labors may increase teacher use of professorial suggestions.

Brandt's analysis also points out that the creation of a strong thrust with adequate implementation, such as the child study movement, is essentially a human enterprise. The attractiveness of trainers and differences in the affective nature of the settings and centers of training greatly influenced the program's implementation. One does not simply build a program and implement it; one creates a social system which supports the trainers and the clients and brings them closer together, minimizing the initial differences between them and helping them to understand each other. It would appear that one of the major failures in inservice education generally has been the creation of a classroom-like climate inside which instructors and teachers do

not appear to understand one another very well. Much more knowledge than is presently available is needed about the process of building an appropriate social climate for the inservice enterprises.

THE URBAN/RURAL EXPERIENCE

The Urban/Rural projects were predictably slow in starting, but many of them presently run relatively extensive teacher training programs. Thus far, the Urban/Rural experience appears to indicate that it is possible to set up democratic organizations in which community members, students, and others (a) provide substantive ideas about the needs of the schools and their communities, and (b) help to develop organizations which can act on those needs.

Mesa points out that some of the Urban/Rural programs have achieved very high degrees of parity, e.g., the degree to which the entities involved in the planning of Urban/Rural programs (community members, students, teachers, school administrators and higher education personnel) have relatively equal voices in determining the objectives to be achieved by the program and the organizational structures needed to implement them. It appears that when extensive parity has been achieved, the program is more likely to be relevant to the local needs of the community. The preliminary evidence indicates that the thesis of Urban/Rural is being realized; parity, in other words, does achieve relevance and vigor of action. There is also evidence that in some programs pupil learning has increased as a result of the design of the program. Mesa points out that if any one interest group dominates--whether it be the institution of higher education, the school district, or the community--the loss of parity is structurally similar. In other words, however parity is disturbed in a cooperative enterprise, the results are the same.

The Urban/Rural experiment provides further evidence that the "consortium way of working" can be effective and that the community deserves as much consideration and leadership opportunity as does any of the other entities which are typically involved in the inservice process. The Urban/Rural experience is particularly striking because most of the traditional literature in teacher education emphasizes the integral position of school districts and higher education institutions in the governance of inservice teacher centers. There is more recent discussion of the potential role of professional organizations and of state departments of education, but the

community is seldom considered to be an active participant except through the board of education, whether in the literature or in general practice.

THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY EXPERIENCE

Nelson describes several models of inservice education, one of which is exemplified by the extensive programs carried on by the Montgomery County schools. The models she describes are:

(a) The Higher Education Model
(b) Contemporary Topics Institutes
(c) The Model of Commerce
(d) The IHE-LEA Cooperative Model
(e) The Systematic Corporate Model

The higher education model is essentially the abdication of responsibility by the school district for the inservice education of its teachers. Under it, the local higher education institution offers such courses as it feels it should, and the teachers in the area participate in them. The contemporary topics institutes follow contemporary trends. Generally speaking, consultants and representatives of higher education institutions visit the district for one, two or three days and expose teachers to ideas. There is little follow through, and the teachers themselves are left to implement the new approaches to education as best they can. The model of commerce is similar in that consultants, generally working independently, offer training workshops of various degrees of extensiveness. Sometimes these are followed up by local education agency personnel and sometimes they are not. The IHE-LEA cooperative model represents an attempt by the school district and the higher education institution to coordinate higher education offerings in accordance with the needs of the school district, with some financial support by the district being provided as well. Nelson points out that this model usually turns out to resemble the higher education model in that the institutions of higher education simply are not flexible enough to create new offerings which accommodate the needs of the school district. The systematic corporate model is the one with which Nelson has had the greatest experience in Montgomery County, Maryland. Under it, the school system, involving teachers, supervisors, and others responsible for the education of children, identifies the purposes of the school district. Teaching roles are then described in relation to those purposes, and performance criteria are developed for teachers who occupy those roles. Working from

that, varieties of inservice training courses are developed to enable teachers to develop the competency necessary to carry out the roles they actually assume in the school district.

Using this model, the Montgomery County School System offers extensive courses (about one for every twenty teachers) each year, which are closely attuned to the system needs. In addition, because of the extensiveness of the offerings, Nelson feels that it also accommodates many of the individual interests of teachers. The entire program is evaluated in accordance with changes of teacher performance as a result of the inservice teacher education process, and ultimately, in terms of the performance of the children with whom they are working. Thus, the school district, acting as a corporate entity, seeks to identify its purposes, the types of positions its staff will play, the competencies necessary for those positions, and subsequently builds a program of inservice education closely tied to those competencies. The entire process can be evaluated in terms of the purpose of the school system and the responsibilities of its personnel. Nelson clearly favors the corporate model, feeling it is most closely tied to teacher needs. She recognizes that teachers, and particularly teacher organizations, have not been involved as substantially as they might be but feels that the system is flexible enough to incorporate input from and provide leadership roles for those sources.

The Montgomery County experience points up the responsibilities of the school system itself for the education of its teachers and also clarifies the necessity for relating inservice education to the specified performances of teachers in the roles they play in classrooms, learning centers, and teaching teams.

ISSUES

The issues that emerge in these papers are quite clear.

First of all, each of them describes extensive inservice teacher education efforts. Montgomery County offers three hundred courses taken by an average of twenty teachers apiece, or six thousand units of teacher attendance in a school district of 6800 total personnel. The twenty-five Urban/Rural sites represent community controlled inservice education in twenty-five communities across the United States. The child study movement reached at least 70,000 teachers over a period of thirty years and probably many more.While these are not

typical examples, they demonstrate that inservice teacher education is presently a massive enterprise, the extent of which has not yet been fully determined. Each example makes extensive use of teachers as trainers. (Montgomery County actually includes a program to assist teachers to become inservice instructors.) Since it appears that most teachers prefer to receive instruction from active teachers it is worthwhile to learn how extensive this practice is and how well it is received.

Second, the child study movement demonstrates the importance of inservice thrusts in which scholars attempt to bridge the gap between scientific inquiry and the art of the practitioner. The success of the movement demonstrates that it can be done, but that it can only be done when there is an extensive cadre of personnel who are well supported, find a good deal of satisfaction in their work, and who have tools to reach teachers. It is important for us to develop a much clearer picture than we have about the numbers of personnel who are presently involved in inservice education, the kinds of things that are being offered, the kinds of capability that exist for nurturing such scholar/teacher relationships on a large scale.

Third, the Urban/Rural experience demonstrates that communities can organize themselves so that professionals, community members and higher education personnel can work together to determine needs and to establish priorities. The preliminary analysis of data from the Urban/Rural program indicates that there is a relationship between cooperative process parity achieved and the extensiveness and richness of the teacher education programs at its sites. The involvement of the community has apparently been beneficial to teacher education in Urban/Rural programs. Alternative mechanisms for including community members in decision-making need to be identified and experimented with in the years ahead.

Fourth, the Montgomery County experience suggests that a school district can offer a wide range of courses that can simultaneously suit the needs of teachers and the purposes of the system. Nelson stresses that the course offerings should be related to an analysis of the roles that teachers actually play in the classroom. She recommends the systems approach used by Montgomery County schools whereby committees of teachers and supervisors establish the performance criteria which are required in the teaching roles that have been developed in that county. Courses are then offered related to those performance criteria. Moreover, in a district of that size, it

is possible for the spectrum of courses to cater to teacher-felt needs as well as system needs. As she indicates, it is reasonable to suppose that, given 6800 teachers, something which appeals to one teacher will probably appeal to a group large enough to warrant offering a section of a course or workshop.

Nelson stresses credentialing and salary increments as the primary incentives for inservice education and points out that few effective alternatives have been created thus far. She does not mention that Montgomery County employs many teachers during periods ranging from one to six weeks during the summer, specifically for inservice courses, thus combining an immediate financial reward with time for intensive inservice education. The community has taxed itself to make this possible, not without controversy, but the practice has been long established. Montgomery County also rotates teachers out of the classroom into supervisory positions so that much of the informal supervision which teachers receive is from persons who are intimately connected with the teaching profession. It is clearly possible to establish a vast number of job-sharing arrangements whereby, rather than having a cadre of supervisors totally separated from the cadre of teachers, the jobs are shared by at least some of the personnel.

THE CHILD STUDY MOVEMENT

Richard M. Brandt
University of Virginia

The roots were established at the University of Chicago in the late 1930's for what was to become perhaps the most widespread, influential inservice teacher education program in the history of American education.

After several formative years at the University of Chicago the leadership of the child study program, as it came to be called, moved to the Universities of Maryland and Texas in 1947. The University of Texas provided inservice staff training in school districts throughout the state for several years. Under the direction of Daniel Prescott and his staff, the Maryland program soon took on national stature, spreading rapidly from the East to the West coast, from the South to the Midwest. At its peak the Maryland program operated in over a dozen states at a time and had more than 3000 teachers participating. Throughout its three decades more than 70,000 teachers and administrators received at least a year of child study training.

NATURE OF THE PROGRAM

Despite its widespread implementation and lengthy history, participating teachers, administrators, and other professional staff experienced essentially similar activity sequences. Each participant wrote a comprehensive, objective case record of a child and analyzed this record with the help of his peers in a systematic, prescribed fashion. Teachers in a participating school district were free to take one or more years of child study and were organized according to their years of participation into small groups of six to fifteen members to help each other write and analyze their records.

The main procedural differences between the first, second and third year groups lay in the prescribed, analytical steps to be taken as they processed, summarized and interpreted their records. Although each partici-

pant wrote a new record each year on a child he was currently teaching, or for administrators and other specialists, one he was encountering regularly at school, the analytical procedures were designed to provide deeper, more thorough understandings of the child at successive year levels on the assumption that the quality of the case studies would improve and permit more extensive analysis as participants gained recording experience. Procedures were prescribed through the first three years of participation after which groups of teachers opting to continue through additional years established their own objectives and whatever structure was needed for achieving them.

To summarize the prescribed common activities that characterized this program, they consisted primarily of (1) writing an ongoing case record of a child through a school year, (2) meeting for two hours biweekly fifteen or more times a year in small groups, and (3) summarizing and interpreting the record in a predesigned manner with the assistance of other persons in the group. There were no assigned textbooks to read, tests to be taken, or other written assignments.

Consultants from the university visited each group three times a year, and a local coordinator was available to provide occasional interim assistance when needed. In addition, some member of the group served as the leader and took part in leadership training workshops prior to assuming this role and in leader meetings during the year. Participants were encouraged, though not required, to attend three lectures a year during consultant visits.

In brief, then, this program consisted essentially of the direct, systematic study of individual children whom teachers and others in the school were encountering daily. More will be said later about the substance of these studies and the administrative features of this program. Before addressing these matters let me highlight some of its origins and unique features.

ORIGINS AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT

The rapid emergence of the various behavioral sciences during the period separating the two World Wars provided the initial impetus. By 1939, sociology, physical and cultural anthropology, psychology and psychiatry had

all become respectable, distinct disciplines. The scientific study of human beings had become a noteworthy academic pursuit. Scholars were making significant discoveries about the nature of human development, learning, motivation, and social structure.

In each of the emerging disciplines special journals were established and professional societies organized for the dissemination of research findings and the exchange of theoretical formulations. Freud, Gesell, Piaget, and Thorndike typify the thousands of scholars who were creating a vast literature on the nature of man. College and university catalogues became replete with courses dealing with human adjustment and development, cultural change and variation, social structure, family and community life, physiology and genetics, motivation and learning, and many other specific topics stemming from this vast and expanding literature.

It became clear that a synthesis of this knowledge was necessary before those in the service professions--teaching, counseling, nursing, social work, etc.--could derive maximal usage from it. Knowledge tended to be highly specialized and compartmentalized within the separate disciplines as a function of strikingly different theoretical premises and research emphases. While anthropologists selected total cultures and subcultures for their targets of investigation, for example, psychiatrists tried to unravel the inner motivational and adjustive mechanisms of individuals undergoing psychiatric treatment, and sociologists concentrated on social interaction patterns within existing institutions--families, churches, schools, peer groups, commercial and industrial organizations, and sometimes communities as a whole. Within each discipline subspecialities developed, each with somewhat unique problems to investigate, discrete methodologies to follow, and distinctive language to describe the phenomena under study.

The approaches were many and varied, in part, because human beings are extremely complex as objects for study and they function at many levels. It was clearly as important to understand the role of the nervous system in eliciting endocrine changes in persons encountering varying amounts of psychological stress as the child rearing practices in societies manifesting strikingly different value systems and motivational patterns.

The educator, parent, or social worker remained in a dilemma, however, as to what propositions to accept about the nature of the people with whom he worked. He could not be expected to keep abreast of modern knowledge

in each of these developing fields or utilize the knowledge that was available for assessing its implications for the field in which he practiced. The knowledge was buried within the special jargon, theoretical constructs, and sophisticated methodology of the numerous fields and was truly unavailable to him. Without a selective synthesis to pull out of this vast array of new theory and research, he could not be expected to improve his own institutional activities and base his professional practice on what was becoming known about human motivation and behavior.

Recognizing this need, a center was established at the University of Chicago with financial support from the General Education Board under Prescott's leadership. As the underlying professional promoter of the center the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education launched a major cooperative study to experiment with ways to improve the preservice and inservice training of teachers. While twenty colleges and universities and fourteen school systems were involved, Prescott and his staff at Chicago provided the primary leadership and coordination.

Some of the most eminent behavioral scientists in the country spent time at this center, contributing papers, collecting and analyzing research data, exchanging information, and generally trying to sort out, digest, and integrate the vast body of knowledge which had accumulated and to make it readily available to practitioners. Fritz Redl, Lee Cronbach, Robert Havighurst, Loyd Warner, James Plant, Willard Olson, Nancy Bayley, Wilton Krogman, Carl Rogers, and Ralph Tyler were among the many prominent scholars who contributed directly to the work of this center. Although no overall synthesis was ever published by the center, the extreme ferment and interchange which occurred through the four or five years of its official existence undoubtedly broadened the intellectual horizons of many of these scholars and influenced their later work.

The task of communicating this knowledge began in a traditional manner. Courses and programs were established in human development during both the regular academic session and in the summers. School systems from different parts of the country were invited to send representatives to the summer programs in Chicago and to work with the center during the academic year. Teachers, psychologists, counselors, and administrators came from many and often distant localities to take part in these first workshops: Pasadena; Des Moines; Cincinnati; Greenville, South Carolina; Pulaski County,

Virginia; Harland County, Kentucky; Shreveport, Louisiana; Brownsville, Texas; and numerous other areas. They attended lectures which presented overviews of the broad conceptual framework being developed at the center. They read a solid, representative sampling of the theoretical papers and research publications, and they discussed in seminars key concepts and factual information.

The excitement school participants felt as they were exposed to fresh, relevant conceptual material concerning the nature of children's learning and development and as they talked with outstanding professors about the underlying causes of behavior carried into the school year, and the Chicago staff were invited to speak to school faculties to share the information more broadly.

The inevitable gap between theory and practice soon became apparent. During the discussion period following one of the lectures, a Greenville, South Carolina teacher reacted as follows:

> Dr. Prescott, we do appreciate the fine talks you professors make when you visit us. You tell us many very interesting things we didn't know about children; but after you leave I don't seem to know any more about how to teach Billie or Sue or how to treat their behavior.

Seldom have the shortcomings of traditional knowledge dissemination been expressed more poignantly. Prescott spontaneously suggested in response that the teachers write to the Chicago professors and describe the specific children they were having trouble understanding so that the center staff could provide expert interpretation of the behavior and suggestions for coping with it. The history of the subsequent correspondence and the development of the kinds of child records that must be made before they could be interpreted with reasonable validity are fully described in the book, Helping Teachers Understand Children (American Council for Education, 1945).

In brief, the professors were unable to interpret the initial child descriptions which were sent and wrote back for more specific details about the children's behavior and background. Subsequent information was still too sparse and subjective to be very useful. During return visits to the schools an increasing amount of time was spent discussing these particular children and the kinds of written descriptions that seemed to be needed;

less time was devoted to general background lectures about children.

Over a two- or three-year period of regular consultation with the same teachers and professor-consultants they gradually learned what kinds of information were useful and developed systematic procedures for summarizing and interpreting the records. With the right kinds of records and following the processing procedures which had been developed, the teachers gained confidence in their own abilities to interpret behavior and make their own decisions about how to cope with it. Although they became less dependent on outside experts to help them understand particular children, they continued to find the consultants useful in providing assistance in recording and processing records systematically and introducing them to new and relevant conceptual information from the behavioral sciences.

In this fashion a new means was developed for achieving understanding of individual children, and the processes were specified which provided the basic structure for a significant and portable inservice training program.

Each participant could develop his own synthesis of behavioral knowledge by seeing how the various concepts and information he possessed about children in general applied to the particular children he and his group were studying. Thus, it was an ever growing, personal synthesis as he became exposed to more general information through lectures and readings, as he shared ideas in his study groups, and as he followed the systematic procedures established for making and interpreting a solid case study of one of his own children.*

THE UNIQUENESS OF CHILD STUDY

A number of unique characteristics should already be apparent.

INTERDISCIPLINARY NATURE: It originated in multidiciplinary activity, a conscious attempt to transcend the boundaries of several general disciplines

---

*Originally it was thought that each teacher would probably gain most from keeping a record on each child in his class. During the developmental period teachers found that they gained more from making as full a record as possible of one child rather than doing formal, written studies on several children and dividing their energies.

and many subspecialties. In this respect it may have been well ahead of its time, because cross-discipline scholarly activity is still not characteristic of most colleges and universities. Geneticists tend to interact primarily with other geneticists; psychologists with other psychologists. Seldom do academicians engage in scholarly pursuits with specialists in other fields and almost never across an array of specialties. In recent years, admittedly, educational conferences have tended to be organized around common problems, and a variety of perspectives and fields have been represented.

The child study program was developed out of the notion that many disciplines had something significant to offer the practitioner. The philosophical base for this program was the whole child and the notion that many emotions could not be separated from his intellect, his body, or culture. It is the child who comes to school, not just his mind, and educators must be ready to cope with all aspects of his behavior.

This broad, interdisciplinary focus has persisted throughout the history of this program. As will be evident later, it is reflected not only in the comprehensive, six-area framework used to organize behavioral science fields and to process case records, but it has even influenced the kinds of teaching and administrative assignments the University of Maryland faculty assumed. Faculty were rotated regularly, often on short notice, in their teaching assignments from one semester to the next in order that they not become overly specialized.

INDEPENDENCE FROM EXPERT ADVICE: One should note from the description above the gradual weaning of teachers from professors. The university is widely regarded throughout the modern world as the storehouse of knowledge and professors as the final authorities in their respected fields. Eminent scholars, however, do not always agree with each other. Differences of opinion are especially apparent in the behavioral sciences because of the complexity of human functioning, and the several levels of analysis required. Differences are most obvious perhaps when scholars attempt to address the implications of knowledge for the conduct of human affairs. What is true for human beings in general may not be so for a given individual.

What became obvious when teachers and professors began looking closely at individual children was that scholarly knowledge could not be

translated into immediate understanding of a particular child or inferences about how best to teach him. Teachers knew far more than the professors about the complexities of their own classrooms, furthermore, and the specific options and constraints under which they labored. While the professors had a greater range of general knowledge to draw upon in assessing the factors that might be influencing children, the teachers were in a better position to determine which potential influences were truly in effect.

As teachers developed skills in how to observe, to make inferences reflectively, and to assess the soundness of their inferences systematically, they came to recognize quite clearly when they truly needed to turn to specialists for assistance in working with particular children, and the number of situations increased that they could handle themselves.

This lessened dependence on outside experts was not just hearsay, but a built-in feature of the program. Exclusive of the leadership training, professors were present for only one-fifth of the group meetings. Decisions about when to meet, which children to study, how meetings were to be run, and more importantly, what particular information to gather and what it meant, were made primarily by the group members. What the professor-consultants provided were general guidelines, not specific directives, of how to proceed and new material to be considered. The procedural steps to be followed, in writing and analyzing a case record, provided sufficient structure for groups to function in a task-oriented manner and at the same time allowed participants great independence of judgment and freedom of action in the conduct of their own meetings.

In comparing child study with action research and other staff development programs, I do not know of any other programs in which "experts" or administrative authorities play such a low-key role. Child study provides an exemplary example of how much teachers can learn on their own and from each other, with only occasional assistance from "experts" and an absence of ever-present administrative leadership.

THE USE OF SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGY IN RECORD ANALYSIS: A major reason that "experts" were not needed as group leaders was the rigor imposed in the procedural structure itself by the emphasis on scientific methodology. The essence of science is objective information, and it became obvious very

quickly that a teacher must gather a vast body of facts, not general impressions or vague subjective feelings, about a child before he would have sufficient information to make reasonable judgments about why he performed as he did. Thus, the focus of group discussions in many of the meetings, especially during the first-year, was around such questions as, "What do you mean when you say he was lazy or his work careless?" A leader merely had to urge: "The next time he exhibits these characteristics observe closely what he does and write a specific description of the episode or include in your record examples of his work so we can assess its quality."

One working rule that served to impose scientific rigor was an insistence by the group leader that nothing could be used for making generalizations or interpretations about a child that was not recorded in objective fashion somewhere in the record. Participants took turns reading their records and questioned each other about missing details of events that had been recorded.

Describing human behavior accurately, objectively and fully in context is not easy. Consider, for example, the story variations of witnesses to the recent incident in Sacramento when Lynette Alice Fromme pointed a gun at President Ford. Even teachers, psychologists, and social workers are inclined to describe other human beings in general and evaluative terms. If their descriptions are probed for supportive documentation, only a limited number of facts or incidents can often be recalled. It takes considerable discipline and non-threatening assistance from peers to observe and record objective data about a child, to write a useful and complete record, and to overcome this natural inclination.

Scientific methodology is also practiced during the analysis and summary stages. Midway in the first year, for example, each teacher used to select one behavior and with the group's help make a list of possible underlying or contributing causes for such behavior. In generating this list of hypotheses, the child in question was momentarily forgotten so that knowledge about children in general and background factors might be included. The record of the particular child in question was then read in its entirety, and each time a fact was found which supported a particular hypothesis, a "+" was entered beside it. Each time a fact was found which would cause one to reject an hypothesis a "-" was entered beside it. Participants' reasoning

was primarily inductive during the generation of the hypotheses, but deductive when it was determined whether or not a fact tended to support various hypotheses.

In this fashion the record was analyzed closely up to this point in time and the list of hypotheses showing (1) which factors had a good deal of support and were likely contributors to the behavior of this particular child, (2) which tended not to be applicable, and (3) areas of information which had not yet been tapped. The latter pointed out gaps in the record and aspects of the child's life that needed investigation.

Later in the first year, participants read their records again from the beginning and inductively generated lists of recurring behavior. Examples of such behavior might be:

> Turns in assignments late -- 9/12, 9/27, 10/13, 10/15, 11/18, 3/11, 4/13;
>
> Fights with classmates on school grounds -- 10/14, 3/16, 3/20;
>
> Volunteers correct answer to teacher question -- 9/20, 9/22, 10/11, 10/28, 11/2, 12/3, 12/7, 1/3, 1/7, 1/10, 1/15, 1/28, 2/5, 2/20, 3/3, 3/6, 4/8, 4/11, 4/15, 4/25, 5/2, 5/4, 5/8, 5/20, 5/22, 5/28.

A complete list might include twenty to fifty patterns, depending on the overall length of the record, its objectivity, and the specificity in which behavior was recorded. The latter quality allows such patterns as "fighting with classmates on school grounds," and "fighting with siblings" to be identified rather than just "fighting." Subjective remarks, such as "likes school" or "seems happy" were not included, whereas "states that he likes school," or "expresses enjoyment about something he is doing" were. Again judgments often became the subject of group discussion as a record was being processed which highlighted the distinction between fact and opinion, an important feature of scientific thinking. The list as a whole provided a concise profile of the child's behavior throughout the year and the basis for final judgments about what developmental tasks he would seem to be working

on, progress he was making, problems he was having, his specific assets and liabilities, how the school was helping, and what more it might do on his behalf.

In the second and third years, when records tended to be more complete and objective, another scientific procedure was used in order to process data more continuously as the record was being written and permit greater depth of analysis. Facts were classified according to the areas of his functioning to which they seemed most related. These areas stemmed from the synthesis of behavioral science that the consultants had identified, namely, (1) physical processes -- health, size, strength, agility, growth status, etc.; (2) affectional processes such as the nature of home relationships and the quality of his acceptance in close, personal relationships; (3) socialization processes, including the cultural patterns he was exposed to at home, in the community and at school; (4) peer group processes, i.e. how he interacted with peers, his general status and specific roles; (5) self-developmental processes which included his cognitive abilities, interests, attitudes, achievements, and motivational tendencies; and (6) self-adjustive processes, i.e. the defense mechanisms he exhibited under stress or anxiety.

As information was read it was classified into one or more of these areas, often using the Dewey Decimal System so that later in the year the facts could be pulled together area by area as a basis for in-depth summaries and interpretations. A final synthesis of the area summaries concluded the second and third year processing. Certain procedural differences distinguished second and third year processing which were designed to increase the emphasis on the child's own awareness of self and his perceptions of his world.

Scientific thinking about children and school permeated the entire program. Teachers were almost constantly forced to distinguish between fact and opinion; to recognize when they were merely summarizing what had occurred and when they were interpreting it; and to be orderly and systematic in their ordering of information and assessing it. They alternately employed inductive and deductive thinking as they generated hypotheses, tested them, classified information, summarized and interpreted data. They became increasingly disciplined, through the rigors of science, to new ways of perceiving children and their own teaching as well.

THE INFLUENCE OF GROUP DYNAMICS AND INFORMAL COMMUNICATION: While scientific methodology provided the underlying procedural steps to be followed and the six-area framework suggested the substantive coverage, group discussion and informal interchange served as the principal instructional medium. Group members took turns reading material they had recorded on their children and questioning each other about the accuracy of descriptions and the details of various events. They helped each other work through the summary and interpretation procedures. They shared ideas and debated about the significance of particular facts in relation to the procedural steps being taken. If one second-year teacher felt that the fact "a child put his head on his desk during social studies" should be classified in area one (physical), another teacher might argue that it seemed more indicative of an interest (area five: self developmental). In the ensuing debate one would either convince the other which area seemed to provide the better classification, in terms of where similar facts about this child had been placed, or they would agree to keep it in both areas. It was during these many interchanges over what specific information meant and how it related to the cognitive step being undertaken at the time that group members shared various ideas about child development and reconsidered their own.

For free interchange to occur the leadership had to be supportive, non-dogmatic, and open. The most timid members needed encouragement to give their opinions; the most talkative required gentle reminders that others should have their say. In contrast to group therapy sessions, where the agenda are often developed by the group itself, there were general steps to take and general guidelines to follow, but much latitude in how specifically the group might best proceed. Information processing provided sufficient task orientation for each group but allowed for great variation in the precise judgments that were made. The success of most groups was probably due in great part to this blend of (1) task focus in processing specific information and (2) complete freedom for the group to reach its own decisions about how to do it without being told they were right or wrong by an authority figure.

Obviously the success depended in great part also on the personality mix of the leaders and group members. Membership in leadership workshops and the program itself was almost always voluntary, and participants felt

free to drop out without external harassment if other pressures became too great or the program did not meet expectations. Some attrition occurred each year, generally during the first few sessions when the obligations were becoming explicit and members well acquainted. Undoubtedly some attrition could be attributed to group members not wishing to put up with others for an entire year of close interaction. For some, the leadership style was too directive and for others, not directive enough. For those remaining, a solid esprit de corps usually emerged, in which opinions could be challenged and ideas exchanged quite freely without destroying the general sense of support members felt for each other. The tone of discussion was typically professional, task-oriented and child-centered, not gossipy or overly condemning of school or home.

Leadership training took place in summer workshops located in or near the school district, often in a camp or recreational setting. Dress was casual, schedule flexible though extensive -- generally two weeks of seven-hour days -- and style most informal. First names were used even for the consultants. The day consisted of a semi-formal lecture - discussion of conceptual material by the consultant, a two-hour laboratory session to work with previously written case records in the same manner as they would be processed during the coming year, a reading-study period, and some recreational activity. Much of the consultant instruction was done by modeling the role leaders might assume the following year. Consultants served as leaders during the laboratory sessions, for example, and instead of telling groups precisely how to interpret a bit of behavior, they would simulate a leadership role (1) by suggesting how groups had worked on interpretation and (2) by eliciting potential interpretations from the group which could then be tested. The consultants, in brief, role-played the leadership patterns to be followed. Other instructions were given as groups encountered specific process problems, and solution options would be elicited from the group, suggested by the consultant, and debated in terms of the applicability to the problem at hand.

Participants were given very few handouts outlining procedures. Articles and books covering conceptual and substantive material were readily available and referred to often. The suggestions which consultants made regarding such matters as the type of child to study, sources of data to be

used, behaviors to notice, practical suggestions for making notes while teaching, and steps to be taken during the analysis and summary stages were generally offered during the laboratory periods in the context of the records under study. Typically several options were presented of how other groups dealt with these matters, not as tightly prescribed directions that had to be followed. Of the three books that now present such specific suggestions (ACE Commission on Teacher Education, Perkins, 1969, and Prescott, 1957), only one was available before 1957.

This low-key, generally non-directive leadership style was based in part on group dynamics studies and Rogerian counseling literature which indicated significant learning occurred when participants were involved in agenda setting, program planning, and the making of decisions that affected them. The successful leader must know how to provide his group with needed information without assuming the complete direction of the group or becoming the "expert" in all matters. This delicate style of leadership was critical to the success of the program and best taught in a workshop manner where all participants were supported and encouraged to share their feelings and thoughts.

ETHICAL CONCERNS IN THE STUDY OF CHILDREN: Teachers selected children to study without seeking special permission from them, their parents, principals, or anyone. They needed to study behavior unobtrusively and to understand children's normal ways of behaving. To alert a child or his parents that they were making a special study of him could alter his normal manner of behaving and possibly damage his natural relationship with his teacher. The parents might also expect to see the record or to receive an interpretation from the teacher as to what the study showed. It was important that teachers not be inhibited in what they recorded by the possibility of having to share information later outside the study group. The basic purpose for doing such studies was to improve their own understanding of children and teaching, not to provide expert diagnosis and prescription for the particular child being studied.

The child selected for study was merely the means for a teacher's own inservice education, and it was essential from an ethical standpoint that the study process have only positive or neutral consequences for him;

certainly no detrimental effects should result. Study groups discussed their obligations in this matter quite specifically and usually developed a code of ethics which members agreed to follow. This code included such rules as using fictitious rather than real names for the child and his family, destroying all piecemeal notes after they were inserted into the record, making only one handwritten copy of the record, keeping the record at home or under lock and key at school, and either destroying the entire record at the end of the year or sending it to the University of Maryland if course credit were involved for permanent filing in locked files and restricted non-professional research usage. If records were duplicated for use in classes and leadership workshops, names of places and people were changed and special permission was granted by the writer. Participants in classes and workshops were not allowed to keep copies.

Concerning current concerns about invasion of privacy and freedom of access to school records, one might question whether sufficient safeguards were in effect to protect children adequately and if these activities would all be considered legal today. The records never became part of the regular school files, nor did administrators usually know which children were being studied. Even group members often did not recognize particular children under study by other members because of their disguised identities. Certainly the transitory nature of the records and their destruction at the end of the year served as a solid protection of human rights. Despite the thousands of children studied, the Maryland staff heard about only a handful of instances where part of a record strayed into the hands of non-child study members; and even then, no damage to the child resulted. One might argue instead that the strong emphasis placed on protection of the records and on objectivity in general in the study of children did much to improve professional ethics.

FOCUS ON INDIVIDUALS: It should be obvious from the preceding program description that the primary focus was on individual children. There is little need to belabor this point. Seldom have educators, psychologists, or other practitioners gathered more information--more complete in terms of life space and of time coverage. While the child was followed throughout the school year, information about early experiences was also included as it could be obtained from parents, school records, peers, friends, and the child

himself.

The analyses, furthermore, led to assessing patterns of development, interrelationships of various areas of human functioning, progress in adjustments to the obstacles he faced in his personal world. Teachers came to see and accept the child not only as a unique individual but, by the third year at least, to perceive the world as the child himself viewed it. Seldom have teachers been more dramatically aware of the uniqueness of human personality than those who study him so closely and so long. Yet often we give mere lip service to this notion of individual differences.

DE-EMPHASIS ON EXTENSIVE REWARDS IN THE LEARNING PROCESS: During the early years of child study particularly the motivation to participate was primarily intrinsic. Seldom were teachers pressured to take part, and relatively few registered for formal course credit. Those who did, received a "B" grade when they turned their record in at the end of the year with the analysis completed. The University of Maryland did not offer a pass-fail option at that time and this routine "B" represented a reasonably acceptable alternative. Despite the wide variation in the length and quality of records and the enthusiasm exhibited in study groups, the "B" was granted to all who completed the minimal analyses. In like manner, all workshop registrants received "B" grades, including leaders.

As school districts began to stress the importance of staff development credit and to recognize graduate credit for salary increments, an increasing proportion of registrants began taking the program for credit purposes. The blanket "B" continued to be used for completed work and year-long participation.

The incentive for participating then was primarily intrinsic and pragmatic at first. If teachers felt they were understanding children and doing a better job of teaching them as a result, they tended to stay in the program.

A BROADENED PERSPECTIVE OF RELEVANT CONTENT: Conceptually, the entire range of behavioral science literature was relevant, not just psychology. The several disciplines and subspecialties mentioned earlier provided material to read, discuss, and use to generate hypotheses about potential contributing factors underlying behavior and suggestions about data to be collected.

Further elaboration of content substance seems unnecessary except to point out that this broad coverage provided teachers with considerable fresh insight about children. Behavior came to be seen as caused and the causes of behavior as multiple, complex, and interrelated. Instead of blaming children for what they did or reacting to them on the basis of simple reasoning, they began to question why they behaved as they did and to consider a range of factors that might be contributing. Included in this range, quite often, were one's own teaching patterns.

DISSEMINATION RATHER THAN RESEARCH PRIORITY: The child study movement had gradually achieved prestige and significance during the first half of the twentieth century as a result of solid, scientific research conducted on children at various colleges and universities. The University of Iowa Child Welfare Station, the Gesell Institute at Yale, the Merrill-Palmer School in Detroit, the University of Minnesota Institute of Child Development, the Fels Institute at Antioch College, the Berkley Growth Center, and Bank Street College were all producing important research data.

At Maryland, however, direct research on children was almost nonexistent. No laboratory school was established, no clinic for measuring development and learning. The focus was almost exclusively on the synthesis of other scholars' work and the dissemination mission.

Even the thousands of case studies that participants mailed in produced relatively little secondary research. Despite their generally objective quality, they lacked completeness and consistency for valid secondary research. What a teacher could notice and record over a year of study was too fragmentary and unsystematically selected to satisfy rigorous research requirements and allow valid comparisons to be made of one child to another. His measurement tools were generally imprecise. The data collected on one child were not sufficiently similar to those from another to allow valid comparisons or replication.

More importantly, however, direct research was assigned much lower priority. The staff was too busy conducting the inservice program and disseminating other scholars' research results to have time to do much research themselves. Several faculty members attempted to launch major research studies as a part of the overall thrust, only to be frustrated by the lack of

time and the competitive demands of their consultant roles. What research was done was conducted primarily by doctoral students for dissertation purposes. The Maryland Institute for Child Study was truly unique among child study centers in that it produced almost no research data about children in the traditional sense, despite a very knowledgeable staff, while almost all of the other centers did almost nothing but research.

ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS

SCHOOL DISTRICT PATTERNS: Organizational patterns varied from one school system to another to reflect differences in leadership style and local mores. Its success depended heavily on the skills of the local coordinator who was selected to run the program and the administrative support he received. His typical functions included (1) explaining the program to teachers, principals, and supervisors, (2) organizing enrollees into groups and recruiting leaders, (3) arranging and scheduling consultant visits from Maryland and providing extra help to groups needing it between consultant visits, (4) conducting leaders meetings, (5) circulating library materials, (6) planning leadership workshops, (7) keeping the administration well informed about the program and (8) generally overseeing the entire program.

Different kinds of staff personnel have served effectively in this role: research and guidance specialists, curriculum coordinators or supervisors, school psychologists, counselors, coordinators of inservice education, and assistant superintendents. Their selection varied with the overall organizational patterns of the school districts and the relevant interests and experience of the staff. In large county or city-wide programs with two to three hundred participants, several persons were often assigned to assist the coordinator in carrying out his many functions. To the extent that he and others involved saw child study as a top priority activity among other responsibilities and a means for accomplishing their total inservice training objectives, the program flourished. To the extent competing responsibilities of the local leadership absorbed their time and energy, it floundered. Someone locally who commanded the respect of both teachers and the administration had to (1) understand and generally believe in the program and (2) devote considerable attention to the operational details if it was to succeed. Meetings were generally held after school or in the evenings

and required a heavy commitment from not only the participants but the coordinator and leaders.

UNIVERSITY PATTERNS: During the 1960's, the ten to twelve person Maryland staff divided into two groups each year in order to cover instructional responsibilities in College Park and consulting obligations across the country. The group with no regular teaching assignments during a given semester was free to take one to three-week consultant trips to school districts. Roles were reversed at midyear with the second group doing the distant consulting during the spring semester and the other group teaching courses and meeting Maryland and other nearby study groups which could be serviced after school, in the evening, and on non-teaching days.

In keeping with Prescott's concern that faculty not become overspecialized in any academic discipline to the neglect of others, faculty assignments were rotated regularly, often on short notice, and staff members became accustomed to substituting for each other to accommodate last minute scheduling changes. Each faculty member was supposedly comprehensive in his academic training and experience, with sufficient depth in the specialties, to draw upon relevant concepts whenever needed in discussing children during group meetings. Synthesis was more important than depth.

Similar to the rotation of teaching assignments was the practice of not allowing the same faculty member to consult in the same school system too frequently less the local program become overly dependent and not free to determine its own destiny by being exposed to a variety of consultants.

The organizational patterns described above provided great flexibility in scheduling assignments both in the field and on campus. Theoretically, any faculty member could teach anything or handle any field responsibility on a moment's notice. Junior and senior faculty, assistant and full professors, were interchangeable parts in a highly flexible delivery system of consultant service to school districts when it was needed.

In particular, of course, the special knowledge and talents of certain faculty, while consciously ignored during open scheduling sessions, were often recognized as part of the unique wishes of the school district in the form of such comments as: "The Superintendent needs to reassure his board that the program is meeting expectations. _____ or _____ought to

make the next trip because the board will need convincing by someone they know."

On the surface, two major principles guided the scheduling of assignments and most decision-making sessions: (1) those whose assignments were being made should participate fully in the decision process and (2) loads should be approximately equivalent over the course of the year. This latter principle gave faculty a basis for volunteering to accept certain assignments knowing that others would ultimately have to spend the same amounts of time away from home.

Hidden agenda, on the other hand, became apparent during many scheduling sessions when no one volunteered readily to go to a particular district at the requested time. Such agenda might include (1) personal attachment to the people in a particular center, (2) dislike of persons or program participants in a center, (3) attractiveness of community to visitors, (4) schedule of consultant usage during visit, (5) effect of travel schedule on consultant's personal and home life, (6) knowing unofficially the desires of a center to have certain consultants and not others, (7) wishes of the director, etc.

The master schedule of consulting requests and field trips, which was constantly being updated, served as the focus for staff discussions about the centers, problems with the program, and the major reason for staff meetings to be held regularly to share in the decision-making process. In this process the needs of centers, the program and the Institute for Child Study as a whole were supposed to provide major reasons for decisions and assignments, not the individual preferences of the faculty.

Because altruistic concern for others had become the socially acceptable ethos that presumably governed all decisions and assignments, self-interests and faculty preferences seldom surfaced directly and group decision-making about the schedule took an inordinate amount of time each year. Typically, the entire staff met for eight to ten full days for planning and scheduling purposes. When one adds fifty-five to sixty days of consultant visitation per faculty member, a regular teaching load of three classes for one semester, a six-week summer workshop assignment for field participants who wanted extra child study exposure, and two two-week leader workshops in local districts during June and August, the priorities seem very clear. The Maryland Institute was organized rather uniquely but consistently in a manner best

suited to serve child study programs. Instructional purposes were clearly of secondary priority. Research was scarcely possible at all under such a system and the heavy schedule.

CONSULTANT ROLES: A true missionary spirit prevailed among many Institute staff members and among more than a few participants. The betterment of children's welfare and the fulfillment of human potential were the grand aims. For those faculty who sincerely felt that child study was the most potent means for attaining that objective, morale was heightened as their professional lives became absorbed in programming rather than traditional academic pursuits. Their psychic energies were focused almost continuously on the program and the people in it--the groups, individual participants, local coordinators, etc.

The extensive travel was particularly hard on staff with families but also challenging and enjoyable if one were a true believer in what the program would do for people. Life on the road is often simpler, more sharply focused than that at home.

Because of the group-centered decision-making and non-authoritarian organizational patterns, individual responsibility was seldom burdensome. Everyone shared in the failures and assumed part of the blame when study groups did not survive.

Overall, relationships were supportive and non-threatening. Consultants' greatest impact in the field often came from demonstrating this kind of relationship pattern in groups they visited. Listening to records and teacher commentary, contributing ideas occasionally as any other group member might and non-directively participating in group meetings were the most prevalent single activities during the trip. The staff usually presented one or two large-audience lectures on child development topics, met separately with the leaders in a question-answer session about procedural concerns they might have, and discussed with the coordinator and other administrators program progress and problems. The bulk of their time was spent meeting each group separately in after-school and evening meetings.

One purpose of their visits was to bolster the group's confidence in the leader, if that seemed needed. Another was to reassure the group that its ideas about both the conduct of meetings and the children under

study were what truly counted and should be taken seriously, not just those of the leader or some outside authority. The challenge for the consultant was to determine how best to participate in a group meeting. He obviously had to clear up serious procedural misunderstandings and he often explained how others had handled a particular problem or viewed a given substantive issue. The tone of his participation was not directive, however, but suggestive with various options cited. He urged groups to proceed as usual and permit him to participate as just another member, as a means of reassuring the group about its processes. What suggestions he might have, whether substantive or procedural, could be offered at whatever point in the meeting they came up. Consultants tended to feel that groups could only accept a few suggestions at a time without becoming defensive or overly argumentative.

It was often better, therefore, for a consultant to raise questions and let someone in the group make the point he was tempted to make. A challenging feature of the consultant's role was assessing how well each group was doing and how he might best assist it--by participating actively, being relatively quiet, and by choosing carefully whatever direct suggestions he might feel had to be made, etc. Each group was somewhat unique and required such diagnosis as to the quality of its thinking and how best to enhance its further development. Becoming well acquainted with teachers in the informal group sessions was in itself rewarding to a faculty dedicated to the release of human potential.

The staff tended to teach classes in much the same fashion. Even though they served officially as course instructors, they often behaved more as class leaders or group consultants. They typically encouraged open discussion rather than formal lecture and a wide range of student input in the structuring of classes. The notion that students learn quickly yet lastingly matters that they consider important was taken seriously. It was less important that a professor lecture well and often than that he stimulate students to reconsider their past ideas in light of a wider range of relevant ones. This he does best through good discussion leadership and introducing other materials to read or consider. Learning and real change occur when the learner is challenged, not threatened, and enthusiastic, not over anxious, by ideas, courses, programs, and professors. This philosophy of learning underlay the particular teaching and consulting style of most staff members.

FISCAL SUPPORT: Budget support for the Maryland Institute for Child Study came from three sources: payments by school districts for consultant service, foundation grants, and the regular university support which any teaching unit would receive. School districts paid $60/day or $200/week for consultant service by 1960, both during the academic year and for the local leader workshops. They also budgeted other items necessary to support the program locally: part of a coordinator's salary (assuming he had other duties as well), travel, books, supplies, etc.

The Grant Foundation supported graduate student fellowships, a few faculty positions, and many special features of the Institute's structure and operation for more than two decades. It was the self-support portion of the budget from direct charges to the schools plus the Grant Foundation help which made the field program possible. The instructional effort was fully supported by the university on the basis of student credits generated.

SPREAD OF THE MOVEMENT

GEOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL TRENDS: Table 1 highlights the historical trends in amount of consultant service rendered by the Maryland staff. To obtain an approximate estimate of the number of regular child study groups in existence, one can divide the number of meetings by three, for the Maryland groups, and multiply the number of out-of-state days by five-sixths. Derivation of this latter ratio came from multiplying the number of days by the average number of groups a consultant would meet, i.e., two and a half, and dividing by three, the number of visits to each group during the year.

Table 1 shows the movement had a full head of steam by 1947 as a result of the workshops and developmental work done at the University of Chicago. Prescott relocated his staff at the University of Maryland when the Maryland State Department of Public Instruction launched a statewide program. Some of the early out-of-state programs already underway, such as Shreveport, Cincinnati, Corpus Christi, and Greenville, were serviced as well.

The peak years for out-of-state activity were the mid-fifties when extensive programs were launched by a number of the California county office staffs as a service to local school districts. The largest programs were located in the Los Angeles, San Diego, Riverside, San Bernardino and Sacramento areas. These programs began to phase out or run under their own

Table 1

SUMMARY OF FIELD SERVICES

(1947-1972 in 5-year intervals)

	Type	Maryland (meetings)	Out-of-state (days)
1947-48	Regular	424	219
	Special (workshop)*	40	---
1952-53	Regular	356	355
	Special (parents)	56	---
1957-58	Regular	348	292
	Special	83	35
1962-63	Regular	246	207
	Special	71	---
1967-68	Regular	392	116
	Special	90	26
1972-73	Regular	154	60
	Special (leaders)	10	6
	Child Advocacy	contract	

*Special includes workshop followup, parent groups, faculty and administrators, etc.
Out-of-state often includes special assignments
Does not include summer workshops

leadership a decade later when county office activities were curtailed significantly by the State Superintendent of Schools.

The district service to groups continues to wane. During the current year (1975-76), groups exist in eight or nine Maryland counties but not in large numbers. Prince George's County has the largest program with approximately seventy people (seven groups) in a revised one-year program and forty-five to fifty in special groups. The major out-of-state program is in a South Carolina county with fifteen groups.

It is sad to see the gradual decease of what has been one of the most vital inservice programs in American education. It survived well and long in hundreds of school systems and some foreign lands as well. In several systems the majority of teachers participated, and it served as the administrations' major vehicle for improving instruction and changing curriculum. One superintendent of a 60,000 pupil system cited child study as his greatest contribution to the school and community over his twenty-year tenure:

> I will probably be recognized locally for such things as new buildings, higher teachers' salaries and work with special schools; however, I personally know that my contribution to the improvement of instruction that has gone on here as a result of the Child and Youth Study Program is more important than anything I have done.

In some areas the influence was hardly noticeable. Yet overall, the total participation is estimated at 125,000 teacher-years. A teacher who completed three years of the program would account for three of these. It certainly represents one of the largest and most enduring of all staff development efforts.

PARENT GROUPS, AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AGENTS, AND OTHER NON-SCHOOL GROUPS: In several Maryland communities and in a few other localities parent groups were established under the direction of a child study coordinator and with consultant service from the university. The parent child study efforts in Montgomery County and Prince George's County were particularly impressive in scope, substance, and duration. While groups sometimes stayed together for several years, no single organizational pattern or program structure materialized to provide consistency across groups and localities as had occurred with the teacher programs. Parents typically did not attempt to write case records

of their own children. We felt that such a procedure might violate the privacy of the home and the intimacy of the parent-child relationships. We wanted parents to learn from each other in informal, supportive discussions that other parents had similar concerns and various ways to react to those concerns; but we did not feel that writing a case study on their own child was as appropriate as it was for teachers.

As a result, the parent groups flourished when good leadership prevailed and members came to enjoy and appreciate each other, but there were few common elements or structures across the groups which could be readily transported elsewhere. Consultants met with groups and occasionally conducted local parent workshops. They lectured, conducted discussions, showed films and presented child development material in other traditional ways. Seldom was a case record examined, nor did some other special activity materialize to ignite a parent study movement nationally.

National and state agricultural extension leaders began re-examining the role of extension agents not as mere purveyors of technical information for farmers and their wives but as specialists in human development who were knowledgeable about how to nuture the development of individual human beings. As with teachers, home demonstrators and agricultural extension agents felt the need to know what the behavioral sciences said about how best to work with people. Over the next decade several thousand agents, covering many states, participated in the summer workshops at Maryland and in shorter ones elsewhere. Several national leaders completed doctoral programs at the ICS and numerous others, master's degrees in human development. While the extension agents and teachers participated in seminars and workshops together, a fully structured field program built around case studies of people did not materialize as it had for teachers. Some efforts were made to induce extension agents to keep good case records, but their contact with people they served was not sufficiently frequent or intensive to make this a feasible inservice assignment generally.

Sunday school teachers and church school leaders in a number of denominations formed study groups and sought Maryland consultant help as they attempted to revamp curricula and church school structure in relation to sound principles of growth and development. The Episcopal Seabury Series, especially, was influenced considerably by the ideas of Prescott and his

followers.

The more that has been learned about the whys of human behavior and development, the more obvious it will be for professionals in all sorts of fields to examine their practices in relation to this expanding knowledge. While the teacher-child study programs achieved the most highly developed common structure and involved the largest number of people, the Maryland program also had significant impact on several other populations: parents, church leaders, extension agents, youth and adult group leaders, nurses, and others.

TEXTBOOKS AND COLLEGE COURSES: It is difficult to tell precisely how much of the change in textbook and course instruction since 1945 is directly attributable to this program. Certainly it has contributed to some extent to these changes, but it is probably not possible to isolate any one factor as primarily responsible.

Nevertheless, some significant influence would seem likely. Broad-scope courses in human development, in contrast to child development and educational psychology, can be found on many campuses today, as part of teacher education programs in particular. Observational and case record assignments have been an integral part of such courses, perhaps less often in recent years.

In many parts of the country other colleges in addition to Maryland gave credit for child study participation to accommodate teachers still working on degrees with them or because it was easier to register at home. In each instance representatives from the local college investigated the quality of the program and often participated themselves in its operation. Both advocates and skeptics, in some instances, emerged on local campuses wherever child study programs appeared. There was also considerable national publicity about the program due to its size and widespread endorsement in school districts, state departments and county offices.

The case study methods began showing up in preservice teacher education programs as soon as those in charge gained experience and saw their utility. Similarly, the broad range of conceptual mistrust attached to programs and referred to by participating teachers left its impression on those not directly involved.

PROCEDURAL STABILITY AND CHANGE: Changes in program structure and content were few and far between. Despite considerable growth in behavioral science theory and research, the basic three-year sequence of activities was essentially the same in 1966 as it had been two decades before. The six-area framework used to classify and code data during the second and third years remained intact after almost three decades of usage. Prescott and other faculty made attempts to add new areas to the framework, but were unable to muster sufficient support to adopt them as part of regular procedures. He talked about cognitive processes as a separate area from other aspects of self-development, perhaps in response to the extensive though delayed interest in the work of Piaget which American educators and psychologists exhibited during the 1960's. Earlier, some of the faculty had tried to insert more curricular and instructional emphasis into the record processing, but without general endorsement of the rest of the staff. Despite the development of classroom interaction methodology, anecdotal episodic description continues even today to be the major means of data gathering by the teachers.

The greatest amount of structural change has occurred during the last decade when the ICS was forced by declining enrollments to reassess its regular program. In 1967, the most successful components of the three-year program were resequenced into a two-year structure. The six-area framework was introduced in the first year to provide formal guidelines for studying the child and all of the forces that tend to shape his development and behavior. In the second year, the major focus was on the child's own perceptions, his attitudes toward school and home, peers and self.

Teachers' increasing unwillingness to commit themselves to three or more years of the program probably led to this more condensed version. Continued impatience with long-term commitments has led to experimentation with still more intensive, concentrated, one-year efforts. Currently, study groups in several neighboring counties are meeting on a weekly basis thirty-two times a year for six hours credit. Consultant visits are made, usually by the same person, to each group eight times a year. This amounts to twice as many meetings and credits and thirty-three percent more consultant help than in the traditional program. This new plan probably provides teachers with less retroactive inhibition from competing responsibilities and more consistent consultant help, but the use of the same consultant probably cuts down on the

transportability of the program because of the group's greater dependence on one person.

Now, as earlier, those who complete the regular child study sequences are often allowed to continue the direct study of children in advanced or action research groups. As indicated earlier, these groups determined what they wanted to study and the kinds of data they would need to collect. Subsequently they gathered and analyzed their data with the scientific methodology they had learned earlier.

The advanced groups typically do not focus on individual children in their totality but on aspects of development or teaching in which a variety of children, perhaps the whole class, provides data.

Currently, the Institute is developing two other types of experimental programs: (1)a teacher self-study in which one records one's own interactions with others, and (2) the direct study of reading behavior.

It would seem, then, that as interest in the traditional program began to wane, there was increasing willingness to design and test out new program models and structures. It would seem that most of these models are being developed and field-tested close to home in Maryland communities, where the staff can monitor more closely what goes on and have perhaps a more direct shaping influence than did the Chicago consultants on the original child study effort in the 1940's.

The most constant thrust through all of these efforts and changes in program structure is the direct recording of objective data as the primary means for conducting studies. In this sense the program has been singularly longstanding and consistent in what it contributes to the inservice staff development effort.

EFFECTIVENESS OF CHILD STUDY AS A CHANGE AGENT

DURABILITY AND SPREAD INDICATIONS: The mere survival of this program over three of the most turbulent, changing decades in our history is by itself a noteworthy accomplishment. It is difficult to find comparable inservice programs in terms of the numbers of people participating, its spread across the country, and its lasting history. More than 125,000 "teacher years" of studying children and youth have been completed. Obviously, a good many educators have found the program sufficiently worthwhile to commit themselves

to at least a year of participation, in many cases without formal credit or reward beyond the intrinsic value of the experience to them personally.

Enrollment statistics can be used to indicate that child study, while perhaps of great help to some teachers, certainly was no easy panacea for the majority. Typically, the attrition rate was over fifty percent between the first two years of child study. In most programs less than a fourth of those who started child study stayed in the program for three years and a very small percentage participated in fourth-year and beyond. One can interpret the significance of these statistics as either validating its effectiveness or the opposite. When one realizes that some attrition occurs for reasons completely irrelevant to the program--mobility out of system, school transfers, pregnancy leave, sickness, competing responsibilities--having forty percent of the participants choose freely to continue with a second year and fifteen to twenty percent voluntarily go through a third year represents strong endorsement. Many participants have given equally strong testimonials regarding the virtues of the program as the school superintendent cited earlier.

FORMAL EVALUATION STUDIES: Testimonials and holding power aside, what hard data exist to show the program makes a difference? Surprisingly, quite a bit. Probably because of its long history, more evaluative research has been done on child study than any other inservice program.

In 1956, Brandt and Perkins digested and synthesized sixteen research studies of the processes and outcomes of the program. Most of the studies had been done as doctoral dissertations or master's theses at the University of Maryland, Southern California, Chicago, Texas, Stanford, or Texas A and I. Only four were based on the same school system and conducted jointly. The remaining twelve studies were independent research efforts focused on different child study programs and utilizing whatever data-gathering procedures seemed available and appropriate in relation to the purposes of the studies.

Considering all these studies together, one is impressed that data were gathered on several thousand teachers in several states from Maryland to California and New Jersey to Texas. Data sources included the direct observation of teachers in their own classrooms, audio recordings of child study meetings, the case records made by participants, teacher interviews and

questionnaires, principals' meetings, standardized tests of both case analysis skills and human development knowledge, attitude roles and projective tests.

Findings were amazingly consistent across sites and programs, despite differences in design and instrumentation. Among those that were well supported are the following:

(1) Teachers improved significantly from year to year their abilities to record and interpret behavioral records. Their writing became increasingly objective and complete. They tended to withhold snap judgments and sweeping generalizations about children, to consider several causes for behavior rather than jumping to hasty conclusions, to consider many areas of causation, and to generalize appropriately about behavior in relation to objective evidence.

(2) Teachers generally gained from year to year in their overall knowledge of human development, as assessed by both standardized tests and accurate usage of concepts during group meetings.

(3) Considerable changes in teachers' attitudes typically occurred. They became "warmer" toward and more supportive of children. They became more accepting of themselves, others, and their environments. Their attitudes toward administrators, other teachers, and parents were significantly altered.

(4) Teaching patterns actually changed as well. They increased their use of praise, encouragement and other positive ways of relating to pupils and decreased the amount of reprimanding, isolating and other negative means of dealing with children. The organization of class activities and delivery of instruction became more democratic and less autocratic in nature.

(5) Not surprisingly, children's behavior became more positive along with the teaching patterns. Analysis of behavioral records showed a diminishing number of negative pupil responses accompanying fewer negative teaching patterns and more positive pupil responses going along with more positive teaching.

(6) No significant effect, favorable or unfavorable, was found on children's standardized reading or arithmetic test or their IQ's. One can say legitimately that the teacher changes which came about as a result of studying children did not interfere with their normal educational progress, they did not seem to help it either.

(7) Several effects were found in school and community patterns. Participating teachers made more home visits than non-participants. Human relationships within schools and between schools and communities seemed to improve considerably. When

> school systems had a high percentage of teachers involved in child study, the numbers were relatively low of children not promoted to the next grade, suspended from school, or sent to the principal's office. In addition, parent education programs became more significant; the curriculum more oriented to pupils' life experiences, maturity levels, and developmental tasks; and better use was made of guidance personnel.

Together these represent impressive teacher change. It is important to recognize, however, that change for most of the dimensions reported above tended to come about slowly and steadily rather than being closely linked to particular steps or procedures within the program. It was even difficult to isolate specific learnings of child study leaders from workshop experience alone, which suggests that the value of short-term workshop experiences lies not in immediate child study learnings but in general orientation and group leadership procedures. The major changes the program was designed to stimulate tended to come about only with the full three-year treatment. The numbers completing this full treatment were relatively small when compared with those starting. Those who stuck it out for only one year changed substantially in a number of ways but not as much as those who stayed two and three or more years.

In a separate study Perkins (1958) asked teachers to make the same sorts of self-descriptive statements as they thought four pupils they felt they knew well would make. Teachers with three years of child study experience were significantly better than teachers with similar teaching backgrounds but no child study experience in approximating the self-descriptions which the children themselves made, thereby supporting a major program objective of giving teachers the ability to view the child and his world as would the child himself.

According to an unpublished staff memorandum, research conducted in the late 1960's after the program was revised into a two-year sequence generally supported many of the earlier findings. Teacher attitudes became significantly less authoritarian during a year of child study. Their own self-acceptance increased as well. They also improved in their ability to withhold judgments and avoid unwarranted conclusions. Additional changes occurred during the second year.

It is unfortunate that this later research was never published, another indication of the relatively low priority assigned to research by the ICS staff. Nevertheless, this program has probably had considerably more

data collected on it than most staff development efforts. The results are amazingly consistent, given the variety of instruments, subjects, times, and locations in showing that the program has been quite effective in stimulating some very important changes in teachers.

A HINDSIGHT CRITIQUE BY A FORMER INSIDER

SIGNIFICANCE AND LASTING EFFECTS: While hard to assess precisely, the overall impact of this program must certainly be considered impressive. Few, if any, inservice programs have been around so long, involved so many teachers or school systems, or provided such solid evidence that participants are significantly affected. At least three million pupils were attending classes under participating teachers during the years in which they were enrolled. The numbers of children and youth who may have been affected as a result of their teachers' earlier participation would obviously be several times greater.

It is still more difficult to determine the nature and extent of the spread effect of child study ideas on other persons and in books, courses and programs. Professional education today tends to reflect such principles and to have a broad, interdisciplinary foundation.

How much can be attributed to this particular program is not ascertainable, but certainly some influence seems likely. A number of notable behavioral scientists took part in the early development work at Chicago. The ICS staff today is headed by H. Gerthon Morgan and includes, among more than two dozen members, two others who have been on board since the Chicago period: John J. Kurtz and Hugh V. Perkins. Among the dozens of outstanding faculty members attached to this program at one time or other are some whose national activities or scholarship makes them particularly well known: John D. Greene, Ira J. Gordon, Walter B. Waetjen, Gary L. McDaniels, Julia Weber Gordon. At the local district level, people like Barbara Hartsig, Orange County; Gertrude Wood and Harry Smallenberg, Los Angeles County; and Helen McGinnies, Sacramento County, illustrate the strong and influential state and district leadership behind the program. It leaves in its wake a vast echelon of top professional educators, most of whom continue to disseminate child study notions within the context of their current work.

One of the most obvious lasting effects is the network of human

development courses and programs now being offered at the University of Maryland and at a number of other universities and colleges where former program personnel have gone, e.g., Glassboro State College N.J. This fall the ICS faculty is teaching sixty-seven sections of various courses and has turned away over three hundred students because of insufficient space. Despite the generally tight employment situation, John Kurtz reports that their ICS doctoral graduates are still finding good positions outside the immediate Washington area. Doctoral graduates with degrees in human development can be found in leadership positions in almost any kind of human service endeavor--nursing, social work, education, corrections, rehabilitation, counseling, etc. Although the academic program is not patterned as directly as it once was on child study procedures, it still reflects a comprehensive, interdisciplinary orientation which seems attractive to a varied assortment of practitioners.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the entire child study movement, including the Maryland program, is the notion that an educational system should be based not just on the knowledge of the world and universe which has accumulated through the ages but also on what has been learned about human development and functioning in particular. The special contribution of the child study program has been to help practitioners absorb and implement this latter knowledge in their daily activities. The program has demonstrated particularly the utility of scientific methodology in understanding and affecting the lives of individual human beings. Its most fundamental premise for teachers, demonstrated over and over again, is that knowledge of individual children affects the way one teaches.

One other significant and lasting contribution is the humanitarian emphasis of this program. The battle between the humanists and behaviorists represents one of the unfortunate dichotomies within the profession today. On the one hand, educational effort requires greater precision in specifying its objectives and more solid assessment of its accomplishments than ever before. On the other hand, many of our most telling critics--Silberman, Holt, etc.--appeal for a more humane system of education built on human needs and desires.

The child study program seems to bridge this dichotomy with its emphasis on scientific, rational analysis of behavior and classroom operations and, at the same time, its strong appeal for understanding and accepting people as they are with full appreciation of the uniqueness and value of each

human being. There is a strong missionary spirit within the Maryland staff which underlies the way they work with people and quite often overshadows their scientific orientation. My appraisal is that the humanistic bent generally takes precedence when issues of scientific rigor and concern for human welfare seem to conflict, but this faculty demonstrates more often than not that the dichotomy is a false one and the two orientations do not have to be incompatible.

REASONS FOR DECLINE: The most likely factors contributing to the gradual decline of the traditional child study program seem to be the following:

(a) Increased competition from other inservice programs: sensitivity training, curricular revisions (e.g. new math), behavioral objectives workshops, etc.

(b) Decreased uniqueness of program substance resulting from human development content being included in preservice courses, professional literature and general media

(c) School district preoccupation with integration concerns and other problems related to social change

(d) Rapid turnover of school administrators, child study coordinators, and increased mobility of teachers both within and without school systems

(e) Increased resistance of teachers to work outside of regular school hours without extra reward and firm contractual agreements: Where many teachers took child study during the 1950's and 1960's on a noncredit basis and without remuneration, boards of education now often pay teachers' child study tuition and increase their salaries when they complete credits earned from participating. Leaders also are often paid extra for acting in this role.

In addition to these obvious factors, I believe some characteristics of the Maryland faculty and organizational patterns played a part in the general decline. One such characteristic was lack of scholarly depth. The emphasis on breadth of scholarship, multidisciplinary study, and synthesis came at the expense of sound, complete, and up-to-date grounding in any one discipline or subspecialty. The rotating instructional assignments from one field to another and the twelve-month schedule of field service for each ICS staff member almost precluded serious writing and research. One just did not have time or energy to keep up in such a diverse assortment of fields, much less to mount significant research activity.

Not only was there insufficient balance of research with field service, the field program procedures themselves became inflexible and hard to change. After three years of participation, groups could choose their own problems and work out relevant designs, and some very creative, fascinating projects materialized. But with the regular three-year sequence it was difficult to make changes because of the diverse leadership and informal communication channels. What changes did occur were evolutionary in nature and a result of long discussions at staff meetings and repeated dialogue with field leaders.

The staff had become interchangeable parts in an organization designed to provide maximal scheduling flexibility and quality field service. Philosophically, we were a team and presumably more than the sum of our membership. We believed in sharing and cooperating closely with each other on all things. Theoretically, no one was more or less valuable to the team than anyone else. Everyone was to receive equal consideration and treatment.

Pushing hard for one's own assignment preferences was taboo, not showing proper team spirit. There was little place for individual striving or status seeking. Group acceptance, support, and a sense of mission were the rewards for denying one's individuality.

An inordinate amount of time was spent in group planning and committee activity. People had hidden agendas reflecting their natural individual desires, but during staff meetings one had to be careful not to let them show. Close friends occasionally would suggest what the other's assignments might be. Long pauses occurred while we waited for someone to volunteer for an unpopular assignment. If you occasionally volunteered for one, it removed some of the burden for doing so again until everyone else had taken a turn volunteering after a long pause. Volunteering too quickly was also frowned on, as it reflected a self-centered, non-team orientation. After all "the local center might have certain special needs which would preclude you" and it became appropriate to explore what those needs might be first.

Part of the decline, I submit, came from an insufficient outlet for faculty members with individual and unique contributions to make. A number of outstanding faculty ultimately resigned to accept positions that would permit greater expression of individual interests.

One of the significant notions coming from both counseling literature and family research was the importance of unqualified acceptance in

human interaction. The staff attempted to model this quality even in their relationships with each other. Again group process was slowed because it was not easy to disagree openly or argue strongly with people you were supposed to accept.

Thus, the very group patterns we believed in so strongly ultimately weakened the organism. We were not tough enough on each other, because strong and open dissent was not permitted. We had to meet our personal needs too often in less than an open, frank manner. There were severe restrictions on the kind of individual needs a good ICS staff member should have or express without showing disloyalty to the overall mission.

The ultimate result was a certain deterioration in staff morale, especially among those who had not been with Prescott in Chicago during the early and middle 1940's. The same sense of program ownership was never felt by later staff members, like my elf, because in part we were not really able to add our own modifications.

In addition, the lack of open dissent and unchanging structure, while behavioral science was generating all kinds of new conceptual material and observational procedures, gradually found the ICS no longer in the forefront of ideas. The exciting arena of fresh, intellectual exchange was no longer.

Even the synthesis had developed a party line, with self-theory in vogue. There is nothing wrong with self-theory, but it does not represent all that psychology has to offer the practitioner.

With such insidious tendencies toward decay, it is amazing that the program maintained its vitality for so long. This alone bears testimony to its basically sound qualities.

LESSONS FOR FUTURE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Studying behavior directly, i.e. collecting and using one's own data, is a highly valuable way to improve oneself as a professional practitioner. It forces one to recognize the complex network of interacting forces that gives rise to behavior. It helps one to see how general knowledge about children and youth is applicable in specific ways to particular children. Even teaching patterns change to reflect this new understanding.

The value of and need for such effective inservice activities is as great as ever. After collecting extensive observational data to determine

the degree to which certain prescribed educational ideas were actually being implemented in sixty-seven schools, a team of researchers (Goodlad, Klein, and associates, 1970) concluded recently that classroom instruction is generally quite traditional. Despite much talk about individualized instruction, inductive learning, supplementary and enrichment activities, and prescriptive teaching, little evidence was obtained that showed these recommended teaching practices in force.

One apparently can understand and articulate general theory and knowledge quite well without being able to act on it while teaching. Although I generally have students do other types of directed observation than a complete record of a child in the Maryland pattern, I did assign such studies to a recent human development class as the major semester-long project and found it as useful and enlightening as ever. More sophisticated in general knowledge and preservice training than their predecessors of a generation ago, teachers today can still profit from observing closely and recording accurately the behavior of children they teach and from trying to organize and interpret their data in some reasonable fashion.

In staff development activity today one may hear a fine speech, attend exciting weekend retreats, see a superb demonstration, or participate actively in group discussions. I remain skeptical that any lasting, significant effects are produced by one-shot, short-term sessions which demand relatively little overall commitment from participants themselves. In child study, the commitments were extensive in duration and depth, and the learnings were in direct proportion to the degree of such commitments. Significant learning seldom happens overnight, no matter how stimulating the event seems to be. The burden of proof rests with those advocating intensive, short-term kinds of staff development to show that their programs have lasting impact.

One of my concerns regarding today's staff development programs centers on the willingness of teachers to make sufficiently long-term commitments to an inservice activity in order to reap the full benefit intrinsically. Course credit, extra pay, free tuition, and released time stimulate attendance and nominal participation, but unless the staff development activity itself actually centers on those issues of genuine concern to the participants and unless they are induced to put forth considerable effort of their own, substantial impact is unlikely. Some of the reward for in-

service learning must be intrinsic; it cannot all be negotiated at the bargaining table.

Certainly one of the lessons to be learned from this program is how much teachers can learn from each other when the conditions are right. Four-fifths of the time teachers met in the absence of an external authority with only some general guidelines to follow and their own judgment to fall back on. The tasks to be done allowed for considerable variation from one group to the next and gave participants considerable latitude in deciding when and how things should be done.

When consultants visited, they attempted to reinforce this sense of autonomy by being as supportive as possible of whatever the group was doing, unless trouble or confusion was clearly apparent. They made suggestions sparingly and often only in response to direct questions from someone in the group. They tried to insert suggestions as "other ways one might view the situation." It might seem a waste of taxpayers' money to send a consultant from Maryland to California and not have him talk more than ten to twenty percent of the time during his meetings with teachers; but we knew that much of what we had to do was merely reassure groups that they were doing well. The best way to provide this reassurance was not to tell them so but to listen closely to what they were doing and take part in discussion in the same way as the regular group members. We taught best by modeling the type of participant behavior we hoped would continue in our absence. We were particularly careful not to take over the leader's role during the visit. Whether one can play this kind of role regularly and at the same time conduct research successfully is debatable.

Another distinguishing characteristic of the consultant was our informal, friendly, accepting manner. We tried to minimize status differences and to assume the role of peer and colleague as quickly as possible, thereby making it easy for group members to differ with us and to continue to express their own judgments. This manner of consulting seems particularly appropriate when the staff development activity has sufficient structure, as did the Maryland program, to provide a task-focus for the group. The consultant can serve to suggest options available for working through procedures, clarify ambiguities in the general understanding a group might have regarding what they are doing, or just provide reassurance to the leader and group that their manner of working is indeed proper.

Financing such a program can be quite reasonable, furthermore, when you draw on your own resources for most of the meetings. One of the reasons many inservice programs are so expensive is their need for an outside consultant at all the meetings. The blend of intensive workshop training for leaders, appropriate assignment of an experienced and skillful local coordinator, and sufficient back-up service from consultants several times yearly, provides a good model for other staff development programs from both an organizational and a fiscal standpoint.

Perhaps the primary lesson to be learned from studying the history of this program goes back to its origins. Practitioners were not using or even aware of many of the great ideas and findings emerging in the behavioral sciences relevant to children's learning and development. It took not only a major effort to synthesize such theory and research but an entirely new means for communicating them in the form of a child study program. New organizational patterns had to be established, semi-structured program guidelines developed, and non-traditional styles of consulting practiced before the program became successfully implemented.

Looking at today's inservice needs, I find one potentially parallel situation and wonder if the time has come for mounting another full-scale effort to synthesize knowledge and communicate it so as to affect teaching. Instead of child behavior and development as the focus the area of knowledge which so far lacks synthesis and useful communication channels is educational research.

In spite of the Handbook of Research on Teaching, the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, various reviews of educational research, and the ERIC system for retrieving research information, research knowledge is scarcely available and seldom consulted as practitioners wrestle with the daily problems of education. It is not that no research has been done. Buried in journals and dissertations, books and monographs, are typically dozens of studies on most of the organizational and instructional problems schools face year in and year out. Yet each time a teacher or administrator grapples with one of these problems he starts from scratch. He seldom attempts to discover what literature already exists on the issue and what solutions have been tried.

Admittedly, one finds the literature confusing and research results conflicting in many areas of interest. The characteristics of teaching

effectiveness remain elusive, for example, despite years of research from many quarters. Nevertheless, much is known about the types of homework assignments that seemingly assist learning, the effect of school suspensions on children, and dozens of other important educational issues. Like the child development theory and research of three decades ago, much of it is buried in fragmentary and piece-meal fashion in the educational research literature.

It needs to be pulled out, synthesized and explained in practitioner, rather than researcher, language. The researchers need to take part in this synthesis in order to sift out the poor from the good quality research and to help interpret seemingly inconsistent studies in terms of comparable and noncomparable variables and designs. Practitioners also must be involved in order to keep the focus on the real issues of school life and to help establish new patterns of communication.

I would guess that something parallel to child study in the form of an action research structure might eventually be needed before full utilization of educational research concepts and theory becomes a real part of educational decision-making. Past action research efforts generally cannot provide the model for such an effort. They depend too much on research experts, they lack the synthesis base which has yet to be established, and practitioners have not been sufficiently involved in the design and conduct of investigations.

What may be needed is another major collaborative effort on the part of university and school system personnel similar to the one in Chicago. Whether we have the wisdom to attempt this collaboration, the financial backing to support it, the patience to see it through, as well as the leadership to reconcile the differences that almost always exist between teacher and professor, is questionable. It was done once, as the long history of child study already indicates. If the conditions are right for developing another inservice program of such magnificent proportions and accomplishment, we ought to begin soon.

REFERENCES

Brandt, R. M. and Perkins, H. V. Research evaluating a child study program. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 21, 1956.

Commission on Teacher Education. Helping Teachers Understand Children. Washington , D. C.: American Council on Education, 1945.

Goodlad, J. I., Klein, M. F., et al. Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1970.

Perkins, H. V. Human Development and Learning , 2nd ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1974 .

Perkins, H. V. "Teachers' and Peers' Perceptions of Children's Self-Concepts." Child Development, 29, June, 1958, 203-220.

Prescott, D. A. The Child in the Educative Process. New York: McGraw Hill, 1957.

IMPLICATIONS FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION OF THE URBAN/RURAL SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

Richard P. Mesa
Executive Director
Urban/Rural School Development Program
Leadership Training Institute
Stanford Center for Research and
Development in Teaching

It is obvious that inservice education will receive increasing attention from federal and state education offices and from institutions of higher education. The reasons are clear. The teacher shortage is over and so is the concern of these institutions for it. Criticism of schools continues as do the pressures to change and improve them. Teachers are central in the process of education and since change and improvement can no longer be hoped for through the infusion of large numbers of new and better prepared teachers into the schools, the target for change will now be the teacher already in service.

The Urban/Rural program, now into its fifth year of operation, is a national experiment in inservice education. Though its goals encompass considerably more than inservice education, it offers the only national experience for developing national strategies for inservice education.

The purpose of this paper is to offer the experiences of the Urban/Rural School Development Program to the designers of what appears to be a broad and deep study of the potential of inservice education for improving the nation's schools.

The paper will attempt to describe the social forces and events that shaped Urban/Rural, its unique features and experiences and their value for planning future inservice education programs, its experiences related to the issues posed by the directors of the study, and some summary statements.

The reader is cautioned to take this treatment of the Urban/Rural program very tentatively. The views presented here are based almost entirely on my observations and experiences as Executive Director of the Leadership

Training Institute, the national technical assistance arm of the project. Though the position has given me a very favorable vantage point from which to view the activities of the sites, at this time, before the formal program evaluation is completed, these admittedly subjective observations of the program experience are offered to those concerned with the design of a national strategy for inservice education with the knowledge that this report may be somewhat premature. However, there is a need to proceed with the task of improving inservice education and we hope the Urban/Rural experience will be useful for that purpose.

The Urban/Rural School Development Program was conceived in 1968 just as the full impact of the Civil Rights upheaval was being felt by the American educational establishment. The political and racial turmoil that resulted brought about a radical shift in the attitudes of the public toward government and its institutions, especially the schools. Educators had traditionally formulated educational plans, interpreted them to the public, and then tried to promote support for them. Now feelings ran high that the community should and must participate actively in the creation of policy. Parent groups wanting access to the educational process organized everywhere and demanded participation and improvement in areas that educators had long held as their domains.

The federal funding establishment had the message delivered to it clearly and emphatically. At a meeting held in Tucson, Arizona by the National Advisory Council in May 1968 to review prospective proposals for the Training of Teacher Trainers Programs, all sixty-five of the proposals considered were rejected because their community involvement components did not respond strongly enough to the demands of the times.

Though it was born in this climate, two events influenced the form of Urban/Rural more specifically. One was a visit by the Urban/Rural Planning Task Force to a school in the Ocean Hill Brownsville District in Brooklyn that had just gone through the community control struggle with the New York Teachers Union. The other was the assassination of Martin Luther King which gave tremendous thrust to the Black community's appeals for control of their schools and communities.

"Community control" during later negotiations was modified to "parity in decision-making between school and community;" nevertheless the events of the times compelled that community control be designed into Urban/

Rural even in some compromised form.

The Civil Rights movement was not the only social change that stamped the character of the Urban/Rural program. A predicted, but quickly developing,"teacher over-supply" also caught the educational establishment by surprise, high-geared in the opposite direction and pre-occupied almost entirely with filling the teacher shortage and improving the preparation of new teachers. Indeed, the Bureau of Educational Program Development (BEPD) was formed in 1968 "to remedy personnel shortages in education, to consolidate education manpower training programs scattered throughout the Office of Education, and to reform training for education professionals." By 1970, the "teacher over-supply" problem had arrived in full force.

To sum up then, community demands for more control of the schools and a teacher over-supply were two major social changes that had great impact on the planners of the Urban/Rural program. The question is, what unique programmatic features did the program respond with to the demands of these social changes?

PARITY IN DECISION-MAKING BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM

The single most unique and powerful difference in Urban/Rural from its sister programs is the built-in parity mechanism that requires shared decision-making between school professionals and community. Parity as a concept had been around for some time but was never officially defined so as to make it operational.

Don Davies, Associate Commissioner of Education, stated at one time that the "parity principle was an important factor in all BEPD programs, but not parity in decision-making." "We leave the interpretation of that policy to each individual program with the Bureau," he said. Bill Smith, then Director of the Division of School Programs, which housed Urban/Rural, authored the first working definition. He defined it as "mutual, collaborative decision-making on the part of those rendering and those receiving services." The instrument by which this mutual, collaborative decision-making was to be done in Urban/Rural was a School-Community Council (SCC).

The Program Information Document that has served as the program's guidelines describes the function of the SCC's:

> The School-Community Council shall be comprised of elected representatives from the ranks of teachers, administrators and other school staff; and the community (which will include students). The concept of parity should be reflected in the composition of the Council, with at least half the membership comprising other than the school staff. A School-Community Council should be considered as an integral part of a school district. With the acceptance of an Urban/Rural School Development Program Grant, every system has accepted this option as a condition for participation in the program. The school district in accepting the Urban/Rural School Development Program has accepted an obligation to delegate such decision-making authority to the School-Community Council. Authority delegated to the School-Community Council does not supplant that of the school board nor the authority of state and local governments. The Councils must operate within the requirements of Federal, State and local laws. However, it is expected that local education agencies will provide to the School-Community Councils the broadest possible discretion for making decisions relating to the design and implementation of education personnel training programs for the designated schools within a project.

The Urban/Rural program would be unique among the USOE programs in advocating parity for communities in decision-making.

What has the experience with parity been? The concept has demonstrated unexpected power to survive. All the School-Community Councils have outlasted superintendants, board members, and others who were openly hostile and wanted to be rid of the program. All sites accepted the program with some uneasiness. But in none of the sites have the fears and suspicions of those who opposed community involvement materialized to the degree feared. This is not to say it has been easy at all of the sites. However, even the most originally skeptical and anxious opponents of Urban/Rural today admit that their fears were not realized and that the program has resulted in some benefit for the schools.

The idea of parity has posed a threat to school boards and administrators of many of the Urban/Rural sites. The main concern was how a staff could serve what amounted to two boards of education and two administrations. Also school people feared the intrusion and interference of uninformed community people in professional educational matters. However, the Councils at present enjoy various states of autonomy with differing degrees of parity both internally and between themselves and their local boards. To be sure, about half of the councils function somewhere between partial and total coop-

tation, but the other half have sustained a level of parity much beyond the expectations of many of those who have been involved with the program since or near its beginning.

The role that a successful School-Community Council can perform for the benefit of a school was probably best expressed by a superintendent of one of the high parity sites. "A school board concerns itself with policy and fiscal matters and does not have time to examine educational needs. On the other hand, the School-Community Council can devote itself to examining and responding to the educational needs of the children."

What difference has high parity or low parity decision-making made on an activity like inservice education? Or to ask the question more specifically, is there a link between higher parity and program impact on teachers and students?

Sites rated the top three on parity have generated the most diverse and highest number of staff development activities. One, a rural site, has collaborated with the LTI in the production of a film documenting the impact of Urban/Rural on its schools. Another, a mid-sized urban site, has taken the bold step of incorporating itself and has applied for and won a grant of $330,000 to continue its activities after the funding of Urban/Rural ends. The third held a festival recently to which its community, other sites and out-of-town guests were invited to observe the Urban/Rural impact in the classrooms and to visit an exhibit of the materials, projects, etc. produced as a result of the training.

Staff and community cohesion on the SCC's and in their constituencies is so strong that they have produced changes in modes of instruction, improved school climates, reduced drop-out rates and improved student performance despite surges of opposition from their boards and some segments of their communities.

Not all the impact can be credited to the high parity sites. At two of the sites ranked in the lowest quartile of parity, substantial reading gains have been achieved as a result of the Urban/Rural training. However, at one of these sites, despite the gain in reading achievement, alienation between school and the community at large continues to be serious. Some community and staff are unhappy with the narrow focus of the program and feel that their concerns about the children's affective development are not

reflected in the program objectives. Teacher participation in the training activities has become increasingly difficult to maintain, and conflicts between staff on the SCC and in the school appear to be intensifying.

Other observations of the differences between high and low parity sites indicate low parity sites tend to focus on narrow objectives. Also, low parity sites dominated by community tend to place more blame on teachers, and consequently, these inservice education activities are characterized by efforts to "sensitize" or "humanize" the teacher. On the other hand, low parity sites dominated by staff focus mainly on student or family "deficiencies," that students are not motivated at home, for example. Implicit in the objectives selected is the assumption that the locus of the problems is in students and their families or with the teachers, depending on which point of view dominates.

Given these differences between low and high parity sites, what are the arguments for school-community collaborative decision-making related to inservice education?

Despite the impact of Urban/Rural training on some of the low parity sites, the alienation and distrust people in these poverty communities feel towards their schools is pervasive and deep. Most school personnel, on the other hand, feel that it is unfair to ask them to make up for deficits of poverty that they believe the children suffer from. It appears that the guilt, anger, and frustration parents and teachers feel project upon each other; hence, the difference in character of staff dominated inservice program decisions as opposed to community dominated ones. The diversity of activities observed in high parity sites reflects, we believe, the dialogue, exchange, and mutual education that takes place between staff and community when both are responsible and accountable for the program decisions they make. The process is far from always being easy or peaceful; nevertheless, it appears that the School-Community Council allows essentially hostile groups to work out their suspicions of each other and reach mutually agreeable goals and actions. In short, parity becomes a process by which parents can feel some control of their children's education and where teachers can communicate their problems and needs.

There are other reasons as to why both community and school people should determine inservice education programs collaboratively. It is one

thing to know intellectually that there is great variation in the environments in which schools are set. However, the impact on the observer who actually experiences the tremendous differences that one has been able to see in this program, is virtually over-powering. One Indian site is sixty miles from the nearest town and suffers a 90% yearly turnover in its teaching staff. The children who attend these schools have as minimal contact with the majority culture as is possible in the continental United States. Another site is located in the midst of the most devastated slum of the largest city in the country. A third is located in a former mining center in which this industry has not provided economic support to the community for thirty years. The conditions of isolation, insulation, economic deterioration, and many other factors create or maintain subcultures and life styles almost totally foreign to the average teacher. Even those from these communities who teach in the schools tend to have the effects of these conditions erased as they undergo the typical teacher preparation.

If we have learned anything from the opportunity to work with and experience this great diversity of school populations and settings, it is that there is so much in each community that has uniquely shaped the values, relationships, motivations, and aspirations of the children that there is no possible way for the present patterns of preservice education to prepare school staffs to be responsive to their needs and priorities. It is this knowledge of the uniqueness of their children that the community members of the School-Community Council bring to the interaction between themselves and the professionals.

FOCUS ON INSERVICE EDUCATION OF STAFF

Another salient, if not so unique, feature of the Urban/Rural program is that it is aimed at inservice education. However, great flexibility is allowed sites to determine the inservice education needs not only of teachers, but also of students, community persons, administrators, anyone in the school involved with the education of the children. Other federal educational programs such as ESEA Title I permit or encourage inservice training for staff. But Urban/Rural was the first BEPD program in which it was the main focus. And, of course, given the parity requirement, the twist added was that the inservice needs of staff were to be determined collaboratively by both

community and school people through the School-Community Council mechanism.

AN ADVOCATE LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE

Other federal education programs have had leadership training institutes to provide technical assistance to their sites. However, USOE felt that the structures of other LTI's, typically consisting of a director (usually part-time) an associate director, and a secretary, plus a panel of consultants for field contact, would not serve the technical assistance needs of Urban/Rural sites. Don Davies described the new LTI role: "The needs of this program were for continuous, intensive help from the outside so the process would work." Making the process work has meant direct involvement by the LTI in establishing the School-Community Councils at each site, training them to function as decision-makers, writing by-laws, writing proposals, giving the sites consumer advice, training leaders, mediating between council and school boards, etc. The need for LTI support by the Councils has decreased as they have matured, but its advocate role in the beginning was essential for the survival of most of the programs. Since then the LTI has provided training workshops in evaluation, curriculum, community involvement, and socio-cultural education as well as technical assistance upon request to individual sites. The LTI, through its workshops, conferences, newsletter, etc., has served as a unifying element for the Urban/Rural sites.

The kind of advocacy role that an entity like the Leadership Training Institute has been called upon to provide the project sites is as a consumer educator, protector, and advisor. There is no question but that some of the sites have learned that the purchase of services in the educational market is as much in the tradition of "good old American business" as the market for used automobiles. Virtually the same consumer cautions and and wariness have been needed. Recently, an evaluation package was offered a site by a consulting firm for the price of $10,000. The site asked the LTI to give them an opinion as to its worth. The advice to the site by a member of the LTI staff with a national reputation in curriculum and evaluation was that the charges were far in excess of the worth of the service proposed by the consultants. This and other experiences force us to conclude that school systems need some source of consumer education and advice--naturally from a source that is not at the same time in market competition for their money.

GREAT FLEXIBILITY WITHIN A BROAD CATEGORY OF NEED

The great flexibility and freedom given the School-Community Councils, particularly in the early years, is certainly unique among federal programs. The first two paragraphs of the foreword to the Program Information Document by Associate Commissioner Don Davies that served as the Urban/Rural guidelines declares SCC's autonomy.

> The Urban/Rural School Development Program, under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA), has been designed to build on the talents and energies of dedicated, experienced personnel who are now at work in poverty area schools. They have many ideas about the needs of children in their schools, and they will play the major role in developing and implementing changes in schools participating in the Urban/Rural School Development Program.
>
> They will join all the people concerned with the education offered by the school-administrators, paraprofessionals, students, parents, and the community - in writing a new script for educational performance within the school. The Office of Education will not dictate to local projects. Local school superintendents will not design them. They will be the creation and responsibility of the entire school-staff and local community. The result will be a school with a new environment which is stimulating and satisfying to the child and teacher alike, and, in which the academic achievement and human development of children will be significantly increased.

Those were strong and optimistic statements that were to undergo much negotiation, but surprisingly, they have survived with relatively little modification.

WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED FROM THE URBAN/RURAL EXPERIENCE THAT RELATES TO THE PROBLEMS POSED BY THE STUDY IN INSERVICE EDUCATION?

We have described the origins of Urban/Rural and related the events and social changes that shaped it. We have attempted to describe the unique features that distinguish it from other federal educational programs.

The question now, in the fifth year of the program, is: What has been learned from the Urban/Rural experiences about inservice education? More specifically, what has been learned that can help resolve some of the problems that have generally plagued inservice education efforts in the past?

HAVE TEACHERS BEEN RECEPTIVE TO THE TRAINING?

One major problem with inservice education is that teachers' experience with it has been negative for a number of too frequently recurring

reasons. The training has been unrelated to their needs. It has been conducted in "one shot" weekend workshops or conferences not sustained enough for teachers to learn, practice and assimilate the training. It has been conducted on the teacher's time rather than during the work day, and after training there has been little follow-up support to assist the teacher to implement the training.

Most Urban/Rural staff development programs have tried to remove these causes of negative teacher attitudes in inservice training. Inservice education has been based on needs assessments that included staff and frequently parents. The training has been continual and sustained. In short, Urban/Rural programs have attempted, by including teachers in the planning, to build in safeguards to those negative characteristics of traditional inservice education listed above. What have been the results? These can be best illustrated by a project-wide survey conducted by the Stanford LTI as part of its total program evaluation work. The survey included 982 respondents that included various role groups: team managers (project directors), council chairpersons, council members, teachers, administrators, Urban/Rural staff, parents, school development team members, students, and paraprofessionals. The survey asked all the role group members listed (including 314 teachers) to rate the impact of the Urban/Rural Program at their sites.

Figure 1

WHAT IS THE PRESENT IMPACT OF URBAN/RURAL AT THIS SITE ON TEACHERS IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS?

	MORE SINCE U/R	LESS SINCE U/R	NO CHANGE	DON'T KNOW
(a) New ideas for teaching	80.0%	0.2%	3.3%	10.9%
(b) New materials for the classroom	72.9%	0.4%	8.8%	11.5%
(c) New knowledge of children	70.0%	0.6%	8.5%	14.5%
(d) New attitudes toward children	67.9%	0.4%	10.5%	14.7%

Figure 1 (continued)

	MORE SINCE U/R	LESS SINCE U/R	NO CHANGE	DON'T KNOW
(e) New ways of identifying (diagnosing) learning/reading problems	68.4%	0.7%	8.5%	14.9%
(f) New types of contact with parents	57.1%	1.1%	19.5%	15.2%
(g) Opportunities to upgrade professional competencies	70.5%	0.8%	4.0%	17.3%
(h) Seek input from staff and community in planning	60.9%	1.3%	9.9%	20.4%

Items (a) through (e) should be indicators of program impact on the classroom from which one could infer that favorable attitudes toward the training by all role groups, including the 314 teachers, exists.* No claims are made at this time about actual measurable impact on children in performance. This part of the evaluation is not yet complete, but we feel safe in claiming that a high proportion of teachers in the program hold favorable attitudes toward inservice education. Perhaps there will be further corroboration of this as we move deeper into the program evaluation process.

WHAT MIGHT BE A WORKING DEFINITION OF INSERVICE EDUCATION?

A definition of inservice education has been needed. A number of continuing teacher education activities have been charged to Urban/Rural resources that are difficult to justify in terms of direct service to students. We need to examine the assumptions that underlie the acceptance, promotion, and subsidization of many activities that are classified as inservice education. Historically, courses taken by teachers on college and university campuses for which they have contracted as individuals, with the chief incentive being the acquisition of course credits for salary increases, have been accepted as inservice education. Staff are given salary increments on the assumption that what they learn will be of service to their clients. The fact is that such courses rarely result in direct improvement of services to the

*The teachers' responses are not singled out because submission of this paper was due before the computer run on teacher respondents could be completed.

children. The knowledge and competencies acquired are remote from their needs as teachers or those of their students. Such education might be more accurately defined as career development (for those who seek advancement or change in jobs) or professional development, meaning that the education is broad and of general professional benefit, but not designed to develop specific competencies related to specific service needs.

Considerable hostility and conflict have developed in Urban/Rural sites in which inservice education has taken the form of college courses leading toward advanced degrees and higher pay. The higher pay is not resented; what is resented, however, is the community's inability to see a connection between the needs of the school and the remote form of inservice education observed. In some sites, the resentment has been accentuated when the newly credentialed staff go on to better paying positions in other districts with degrees earned at their site's expense.

The Urban/Rural experience compels us to define inservice education as teacher training based on assessments that reveal the present and anticipated needs of teachers and all other staff to serve their school and its community with optimum effectiveness, with the priority of needs and the criteria for effectiveness being collaboratively established by school staff and representatives of the community.

Our observation is that community members of an SCC support inservice education programs when they can see a close match between identified needs and the training activities.

WHAT IS THE URBAN/RURAL EXPERIENCE WITH TEACHER RELUCTANCE TO EXPRESS DEFICIENCIES AND ASK FOR TRAINING?

Among the problems posed by the study of inservice education is that "the social situation of the teaching profession makes it very difficult for teachers to comfortably express their deficiencies or to ask for training." We're not sure that the problem described here has been visibly manifest among the Urban/Rural sites. Perhaps it has not been observed because the difficulty and discomfort in expressing deficiencies has been acted out in other forms. What has been noted is a strong tendency for teachers to locate the problems outside themselves. The home or child, the administration, the lack of resources and facilities, etc. receive the blame. On the other hand, parents and

children tend to place the problem on teachers, their methods, or the school in general. The experience at a rural midwest site represents the situation typical of many other sites. In this case, the teachers blamed their problems and poor student performance on apathetic parents, poor family life, and the welfare syndrome of "deadened motivation." In contrast, the parents described the teachers as unfriendly, condescending, and uncaring and described the school as an alien place. At this site, the School-Community Council, the mechanism by which these differences might be resolved and transformed into mutually agreed upon needs and goals, was unfortunately not sufficiently developed. Sites that have worked out these problems seem to have School-Community Councils that have developed the skills to conduct broad-based needs assessments in which staff, community, students, and administrators all participated. Processes have been used that reveal the causes, conditions, and histories of problems in such ways that staff and parents do not need to feel personal guilt, but rather can work together to examine them objectively and for purposes of acting upon them.

WHAT STRATEGIES AND MECHANISMS FOR PROVIDING INSERVICE EDUCATION HAVE EMERGED IN URBAN/RURAL?

Four basic strategies or mechanisms have evolved: the resident professor model, the college or university affiliation with on-site training model, the consultant firm affiliation model, and the "shop for services" model.

Of the four, the resident professor model seems to be the most creative and promising idea. It is a variation of field-based teacher education, but we believe the form it has taken in Urban/Rural may be original. Typically, two college or university level teacher trainers are contracted, usually with these conditions:

(1) They reside in the school-community.

(2) They devote full time to working with the site staff.

(3) They observe teachers and do demonstration teaching in the classrooms.

(4) Their training is based either on assessed needs of the staff or on needs resulting from the implementation of an educational program.

(5) They help identify and select other trainers or technical

assistants.

(6) They make the resources of their home, university, or college available to the site.

(7) They report regularly to the School-Community Council.

The advantages of this mode of providing inservice education are obvious: the training is continuous; it is related to the needs and goals of the school; there is time for confidence and rapport to develop between trainers and staff.

The disadvantages and cautions learned are that such professor types are quite difficult to find. They work out best when they take a real interest in the school and the community and when they project a willingness to learn from, as well as teach, staff and community persons. The ultimate compliment given such a trainer by teachers is, "He's great with the kids and he can demonstrate in the classroom what he teaches!" A hard reality intrudes however: sometimes colleges have unloaded their rejects on unwary sites.

The college or university affiliation model is probably the most commonly used among the sites. It is different from the resident professor model in that usually a college representative coordinates the site and college transactions and deploys college staff as needed or as planned. Training is frequently done on-site and sometimes the content is even tailored to the needs of the site. Councils, usually through their executive officers, called team managers, negotiate these conditions. A solid learning has emerged from the Urban/Rural experience with colleges and universities. That is that much can be gained by tough negotiation. Sites have won agreement from colleges to tailor courses to the training needs of sites as determined by the sites, even to give degree credit for such courses, and to reduce fees when the site provides the facilities for training, the captive clientele, and the costs of all materials needed. In one or two instances, sites have located their own trainers and insisted that the university employ and assign them to the site!

Lest too rosy a picture be conveyed, the caveats learned are that in too many cases sites have become the captives of the colleges or universities through contractual agreements that gained few tailored responses to meet the

needs of the sites.

Four sites have retained consulting firms as their main providers of training. In at least one case, they did so because of distrust of the local colleges. The team manager of that urban predominantly Black site said, "Those colleges are the ones that keep turning out the teachers we have to re-train!"

The consulting firm provides the services within its capability. Usually, like the colleges, it attempts to provide every service from proposal writing to evaluation of its own services. It helps the site locate consultants for those needs outside its scope of competence. Our observation is that consulting firms have been more flexible and accommodating colleges or universities, and that they are more willing to respond to specific site needs.

There are several disadvantages inherent in this model. Sometimes the sites are subjected to as much salesmanship as service. It is hard to tell sometimes whether a site is "sold" a need or whether the need is real. They naturally tend to sell what they have packaged and what they can do best.

Some sites have no affiliation or resident professors. They assess their needs, map out their plans and then shop for services as they need them. Naturally the quality of their choices depends greatly on the competence of the staff and council members. Training in these cases appears in most cases sporadic and unpatterned.

WHAT OTHER EXPERIENCE DOES THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM HAVE TO OFFER THE DESIGN OF A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION?

The name of the project, Urban/Rural, literally means that it includes both urban and rural school systems. It is quite clear at this point that the implementation of inservice education has been most difficult and probably had the least impact in the huge urban complexes. Mid-size urban centers have been more successful, but implementation has probably been easiest in rural communities. There are several factors involved. Unions in large urban centers such as New York and Newark rigidly control use of the teacher's time. In one of these cities, the union scale for any after school or weekend participation in workshops is $9.00 per hour. A huge amount of this site's inservice budget has gone to pay stipends to teachers. Under-

standably, community participants in training or planning expect remuneration also but are deeply resentful of the amount that teacher stipends drain from the program.

Rural teachers often have had little access to, or the wherewithal for, college beyond the minimum needed for credentialing. Isolation has kept many teaching innovations from reaching them. Also, because of the generally low power of unions in rural areas, teachers can be directed by administrative fiat to undergo training much more readily than in urban sites. Nevertheless, a difference in quality between low and high parity rural sites' inservice education activities is evident. The focus at the low parity sites is narrow and aimed at notions of the children's deficits; that of high parity sites attends to community as well as staff perceptions of needs.

Like that of another BEPD project now expired, the Training Teacher Trainers Program, our experience has been that "projects appear most successful when their goals coincide with or reinforce local values, local priorities and interests and enable activities to take place that are desirable from a local point of view, when goals are not incompatible with local values."

Inservice education has been more successful at sites with SCC's that have realized their power, stuck to their guns, insisted on their autonomy, and have not let their goals be deflected by expediency, pressures, or role conflicts between council and board. Success also appears related to SCC's maintaining "constructive" tensions between themselves and other role groups in the school-community so that philosophical, cultural, methodological differences could be worked out.

The Urban/Rural program has had a five-year cycle of operation to develop. Recently a sixth year was added as a result of USOE's decision to define the first as a planning year. It took at least two years for funding problems to be resolved, for needs to be assessed and translated into program plans, and for a genuine implementation to be accomplished. Consequently only in the last two or three years can it be said that the sites have fully implemented training programs. So little has been known about how to assess staff training needs for a specific school, it appears to us that time has been a critical variable in determining the successes in the Urban/Rural program. Successful sites have had to be very flexible. They have had to be willing to learn through trial and error and have had to keep a very experimental attitude towards their program activities.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Two important changes in the national environment determined the philosophy and focus of the Urban/Rural School Development Program. The Civil Rights movement and accompanying turmoil compelled the program designers to give the community parity with the school professionals in the governance of the program. The sudden teacher over-supply made the decision to improve schools through inservice staff development very timely. Present educational needs indicate that the Urban/Rural program has some important experiences to offer national and local educational policy makers who are working to meet these needs. Summed up they are:

(1) The concept of community participation in decision-making on parity with school professionals and boards of education has proven viable.

(2) Parity in decision-making between community and professionals has produced inservice education activities more numerous and diverse than at sites in which such parity was minimally achieved. The numbers and diversity of activities at the high parity sites reflect community as well as staff felt needs.

(3) Program activities resulting from decision processes dominated by one or the other, staff or community, strongly indicate tendencies to scape-goating or displacement of guilt. The result is low credibility for program accomplishments and resentment of the implicit imposition of blame for educational failure by the dominant decision-makers on those who are the objects of the decision.

(4) Because of the pervasive distrust and alienation between schools and many segments of their communities, both school and community need to be brought together in some process by which they can communicate, mutually educate, interact, collaboratively produce and be accountable for their children's educational programs.

(5) Community and staff collaboration in decision-making requires leadership training, particularly of community persons.

(6) Any governing body that buys services needs consumer counsel, but experience in Urban/Rural shows that this is more critical

when community and lower echelon staff are involved in such decisions.

(7) Flexible program guidelines within a broad category of need have been instrumental in producing diverse and extremely creative program activities in Urban/Rural. Urban/Rural sites represent the incredibly wide range of physical settings, populations, cultures, etc. in which children and teachers interact. It is inconceivable to one who has experienced this variety how any but the broadest, most flexible guidelines could apply.

(8) The experience of Urban/Rural is that teachers respond favorably to inservice education. Responses to their needs are offered in forms that do not cause undue imposition on their personal lives and goals. High parity sites demonstrate that retention of teacher commitment over time is a function of diversity of activities, activities that acknowledge that the needs are complex and that call for accountability and support from all segments of the school-community for responses to the children's needs. Narrow-focused programs suffer symptoms of eroding teacher commitment, staff conflict over program objectives, etc.

(9) A more precise definition of inservice education is needed. Valuable resources are being dissipated in activities that cannot be identified as inservice education with any justification.

(10) Parity has proven to be a useful process for dealing with teacher reluctance to express deficiencies and needs for training. By having a strong say in determining their needs, and having a forum in which to express their perceptions of the problems and at the same time hear and be free to confront the perceptions of the community, teachers have tended to move with community toward cooperation in responding to the common goals of responding to educational needs of the children. These two equally empowered groups forced to confront and deal with each other have found cooperation more frequently than not

a more attractive alternative than conflict. Our observation is that cooperation begins with the expression and acceptance of the needs each feels in order to respond to the expectations of the other.

(11) Four basic mechanisms have evolved in the program for delivering inservice education. Each has advantages and disadvantages. The resident professor model appears to be the most promising. It should be said here that the sites' response to the idea (it has now spread to eight sites) probably represents a real need; that is, that a typical staff needs the connection to the broad knowledge in the field that a university professor can provide. The district's typical resource teachers would usually be limited in this respect.

The Urban/Rural program evaluation should be completed in the spring of 1978. A number of the observations included in this paper may corroborate, some perhaps may be contradicted by, data gathered and processed more systematically. Nevertheless, the experienced educator or researcher may find something of use here.

CREATING ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES FOR THE IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS

Marilyn Nelson
Associate Director of Staff Development
Montgomery County, Maryland Public Schools

INTRODUCTION

The intent of this paper is to present a review of organizational structures for delivering in-service training to teachers, drawing especially on my experience with the alternatives we have tried in Montgomery County over the last few years. I cannot approach such a review, however, without first addressing the criteria I think should be used to establish such training programs, especially the problem of purpose.

Any organization that seeks a model upon which to build its training program must first address the question of what its purpose is to be; that is, what the outcomes of such a program should be and what the organization expects to gain from the program.

After presenting criteria, I will examine the presently available models and some variations on those models.

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS

I believe that an on-the-job training program should be related to the specific requirements of an employee's job. In-service education, in other words, is not general education. Some elements of the profession have argued against specific, job-relevant training on the grounds that (1) the teacher's job defies definition and (2) any courses the teacher takes that might contribute to personal fulfillment cannot help but enhance the teacher's performance. That belief has been countered somewhat by societal demands for certain outcomes in pupil achievement and by the reluctance of the public to believe that a job cannot be defined. The public that is scrutinizing expenditures and demanding teacher accountability is joined by that segment of the profession itself that is demanding "competency-based" education for teachers.

There is no real reason why teachers and the organization in which they work cannot develop job standards. It follows that in-service training should be linked to the system of evaluation of teacher performance. Specifying the teacher's job requirements and applying the evaluation system can provide information about training needs. Job requirements also provide the basis for evaluating the effectiveness of in-service training. Can the teacher's performance be enhanced by training? What training is most effective? Thus the job specifications guide the program, and the evaluation system provides information about teacher needs and about training effectiveness.

An in-service program should be broad enough in scope to include the needs of a variety of teachers occupying numerous teaching roles. These needs include a repertoire of teaching techniques and strategies, and skills for diagnosing and evaluating pupils. The training available must be related to all of the teachers in the organization and at the same time be flexible and varied enough to be adapted to any individual's specific needs for improvement.

If the purpose of in-service training is to improve teaching performance, then it should also be linked to advanced certification requirements. Such a linkage both relates certification to competent performance and provides one extrinsic incentive for teachers to enroll in the courses that the organization views as desirable. Another incentive might be the awarding of salary increments for successful completion of a planned program. In any event, the incentives should be a carefully planned part of the design.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES FOR DELIVERY OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

In this section we will examine several different organizational models for training. They rarely occur in pure strains, nor should they. They illustrate, however, the possibilities in organization and underline the importance of organization to the delivery of in-service education.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION MODEL: The most common structure for delivery of "in-service education" to teachers is the result of a "laissez faire" attitude

on the part of school systems, or rather, an attitude that advanced professional training is best left to colleges and universities. So prevalent and familiar is the practice of abdicating responsibility to the teacher's major advisor at the local university graduate school that it requires little description. Teachers engaged in graduate study to earn advanced degrees or to meet certification renewal requirements, either in a sabbatical granted by the school system, or during the summer, or in the evening, comprise a large portion of the graduate school enrollment. Yet, any relationship to the teacher's job is coincidental (who gives a graduate degree in teaching competence?); indeed, most graduate degrees in education would appear to encourage the teacher to leave the classroom and to develop curriculum or to become an administrator. There is no existing system to relate the teacher's graduate pursuits and the school's goals, nor is there an evaluation of the teacher's performance. This model does include a powerful incentive, however. School systems pay higher salaries for master's degrees and other "milestones," and some states require several graduate hours periodically to keep a certificate current.

A variation on this approach seems to represent an attempt to relate college courses to teacher or system needs. This is the "extension" or off-campus course program, in which certain college offerings, identified by the school system as being useful or desirable to teachers, are held in a location in the school system as a convenience to teachers. Since the teacher still pays tuition and since the teacher's advisor still determines the teacher's master's program, the relationship to the organization or to the individual's specific need within it is still somewhat coincidental. There is generally no accompanying plan to evaluate utilization of acquired knowledge or skills.

CONTEMPORARY TOPICS INSTITUTES: Another common approach is to build programs around a smorgasbord of topics of contemporary interest. Such general topics as the open school, team teaching, learning centers, individualizing instruction, to name only a few, may be addressed. The common means is to identify a renowned consultant who flies in for a day or a week. The difficulty with this approach to some valid educational questions is that often the consultant will tell the teachers where they ought to be, but

rarely how to get there. The fact that the outcome frequently depends on careful skill-building and that teachers cannot by themselves make leaps from awareness to application escapes the planners. Frequently they seem to assume that teachers have many skills ready to apply to any situation, ignoring the question of where in their professional preparation the teachers could have acquired them. Some schools do relate such topics and in-service meetings to organizational priorities: "This year we're going to individualize instruction!" or "It is our goal to have learning centers in all the elementary classrooms." Often the organization goes so far as to offer teachers a stipend to attend, or to get a local college to offer the "training" as a special project for credit.

This model also is rarely coincident with teacher and organization needs, and it does not develop skills effectively. It is not linked systematically to the teacher's job requirements or to individual needs, but generally it is inspired by current issues in education. Too often it suffers from underutilization (because there was no skill-building), and if there is an evaluation of the effect, everyone is puzzled at the lack of import since the consultant was inspiring and the teachers were so enthusiastic about the meeting.

THE MODEL OF COMMERCE: A third kind of structure depends on consultants who offer training packages. Such programs have appeal in that they are carried on by extra-system personnel. While they are costly, they do not disturb the organizational routines. In this model, a school system buys the services of a change-agent. The changes proposed by Glasser, Dreikurs, and Gordon, for example, are attractive to schools and to teachers, who, with the possibility of released time for this training, hope to learn how to maintain sanity in the classroom and achieve a "school without failure." If this kind of in-service training does not deliver on its promises, it may be due in large measure to the inability of third or fourth generation trainers to transmit the charisma--or the skills--of the originator of the training. Again, the utilization factor may receive no attention; when the trainer leaves, the organization is no longer involved, having made no commitment other than a financial one.

THE IHE-LEA COOPERATIVE MODEL: A fourth plan for in-service programs is based on cooperative, or collaborative, development with institutions of higher education. Generally such a structure consists of two frameworks: one is the existing college or university offerings, which represents what the university can do for the school system; the second is what the school system is willing or financially able to buy of the traditional offerings. Thus, (1) a group of university staff with expertise in training design and familiarity with schools and (2) the identified needs of the school system come together in common cause. The school system might serve as a laboratory for research on teaching while the university uses the findings of that research to design the training for teachers.

The success of such a venture is contingent on initial agreements between the cooperating school system and the university which require flexibility on the part of both. Given a school system with a systematic plan for teacher training related to institutional goals, and a university committed to designing and tailoring programs to the school system's identified needs, such an arrangement could have favorable impact on in-service training, especially so if the school system follows up and evaluates the effects. If such a collaboration exists, it is commendable. My own experience has been that universities tend to tell school systems what is available from the university, regardless of school system need. University personnel, with a few notable exceptions, are frequently baffled by the needs expressed by school system personnel. This results in dialogue that leaves both school systems and teachers unsatisfied. The cause of much of this lies not so much in lack of goodwill on the part of universities but in their distance, measured both in time and space, from public school classroom realities. To be successful, such a structure cannot be based solely on the university's giving credit for school system ideas under a general sort of course title and then collecting tuition from the enrollees, since the benefits under that arrangement accrue to the university and not to the teachers. Nor does it serve the best interests of the school organization.

THE SYSTEMATIC CORPORATE MODEL: The structure that has developed in Montgomery County, Maryland, and the one with which I am most closely associated at the present is a four-dimensional structure: it has (1) a quasi-legal framework; (2) a conceptual framework within the organization; (3) a design

framework; and (4) a support system. Assurance that the four frameworks exist and that quality of program and the structure of the framework are maintained is the responsibility of one department within the organization.

The system has legitimacy from the state department of education in that (1) the state accredits county school system in-service courses that meet certain criteria; (2) credits earned through in-service programs can be applied to certificate renewal; and (3) a planned program of in-service courses related to the teacher's current assignment may be used to meet the requirement for attainment of the Advanced Professional Certificate, according to a recent by-law. Within the local school system, the board of education and the teachers' negotiating unit have agreed to recognize in-service training credit for advancement on the salary schedule; placement on three schedules beyond the entry-level bachelor's degree is possible with in-service credit.

Conceptually, the training provided teachers fits into a school system program of performance evaluation: classroom teachers' job expectancies, as identified by the school organization, are defined by eleven performance statements and indicators that delineate what teachers are expected to do. Training in a number of areas--curriculum implementation, teaching competence (process skills), communications skills--is provided to meet organizational priorities and individual teachers' training requirements. New courses can be added as needs are identified through a local and state accreditation process. Such needs may be new curriculum developments, new priorities identified by the board (e.g. human relations, teaching the gifted, teaching of reading), and new teaching specialities (e.g. consultative teacher specialists) for which training is required. Some two hundred courses are available to teachers, offered on a cyclical or demand basis, as needs are identified by the agencies within the system responsible for given areas. A system of observation and supervision at the local school supports the evaluation of the teacher's performance and provides recommendations for training. There is also the possibility now that the state provision for attaining the advanced certification status by this means should allow the teacher to initiate action on a planned program of in-service training specifically tailored to that teacher's assignment and training needs.

The design of the system is such that all agencies of the school system can submit proposals for courses to be accredited. (Agencies are departments and subdepartments. The Curriculum and Instruction Department,

for example, includes a variety of specialists responsible for subject areas.) Theoretically, those who have the responsibility for responding to and identifying needs of teachers are the ones who would recommend that formal training be provided by the system for a given audience for a specified purpose on a specific schedule. The program design is flexible enough to admit new ideas for training--provided they are justified by what teachers need and are related to new programs, new or established priorities, or individual teacher's skills. With 6,800 teachers in the system, there are predictably at least fifteen who will have the same need or interest. (One school, for example, which contains a program for the auditory handicapped integrated into the regular school program, has a course for its entire staff in Sign English.)

The agency that identifies the requirement for the course also takes the responsibility for its sponsorship: identifying the instructor, monitoring the quality of instruction, evaluating the course's effectiveness, modifying and refining the course design, determining the audience and scheduling for subsequent offerings. The overall responsibility for the quality control process, however, is placed with the Department of Staff Development, as are the fiscal resources for the program and the accreditation of courses. The need for training to relate to organizational priorities as well as to individual needs is recognized and monitored in that department.

Finally, the support for the program from the administration is related both to budget and to priorities. Teachers receive salary benefit at intervals from accumulated in-service training. Further, there is financial support for instructional services for the buildings in which courses are held (after the working day during the school year, mornings and afternoons during the summer). Books, instructional materials and consultant services are also provided, and staff is budgeted to manage the entire program. There are also a budget and staff for development and dissemination of teacher competency courses. There are two major sources for qualified instructors: talented staff from within the system and individuals from local universities who have expertise in a given content. The former group greatly outnumbers the latter. In some types of courses--notably teacher competency where adequate numbers of trained instructors are not available from institutions of higher education--teachers with potential talent are identified and trained, part of the training being an internship with a qualified instructor. Thus, resources are provided for the development of instructional staff.

In addition to the regular ongoing evaluation of each course, which is largely participant feedback, there is a limited assessment program, begun in 1975, to ascertain the degree to which a given course affects teachers' behavior in the classroom--a validation of the objectives. To reduce bias, this assessment has been carried out by individuals outside the school system.

How does this system measure up according to the criteria identified at the outset? It is related to the school system's goals through program design and through its linkage to the teacher evaluation system. It is broad enough to include knowledge and skills in many areas; some three hundred sections of the two hundred options are offered within the year. It is implementable; it can be monitored; it can be, and is, to a limited extent, evaluated. It is appealing to teachers because of both salary and licensing benefits, and because its costs are borne by the board of education. There are at least three identifiable weaknesses. It is not yet broad enough to include all the types of internships asked for by teachers, although there is an arrangement of that type for one specialty: teachers of exceptional children. The system is, however, flexible enough to include internships for teachers if logistical problems can be solved. The second possible weakness is that it may not require enough of teachers, since their only commitment is time and energy. They do not have to follow through. The third is that it is still part of the credit-counting approach--no really solid alternative incentive plan has been generated.

IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR THE FUTURE

School districts and states are presently at many different stages in the evolution of in-service training. It is safe to project that many are still relying solely on college courses and sabbaticals for professional development, while a few have complex teacher training programs that complement organizational and teacher needs, like the one just described.

There is one serious problem in the base of research on teaching that should form the structure for teacher training programs. I made reference to the importance of having a job description for teachers as a basis for developing a systematic training program. With our present knowledge base we can develop descriptions, but they may not be sound. There is insufficient

evidence from research on teaching to establish relationships between teaching and learning. Hence expectations for teacher performance that exist must be based largely on assumptions about effective teaching. The critical missing element in training, then, is an established relationship between variables in teaching and learning. School systems, of course, do not have the resources to conduct the massive studies required although they can serve as laboratories. Such research is the business of rational institutes. But until such research begins to reveal with greater clarity what it is teachers can do that makes a difference, job descriptions and training programs will continue to be built on assumptions about effective teaching.

Illustration

MONTGOMERY COUNTY IN-SERVICE COURSES

1975 - 1976

Ceramics, Sculpture, and Creative Crafts in Elementary Art: I
Ceramics, Sculpture, and Creative Crafts in Elementary Art: II
Drawing, Painting, and Graphic Processes in Elementary Art: I
Drawing, Painting, and Graphic Processes in Elementary Art: II
Contemporary Sculpture Processes and Techniques
Print Making
Art Forms Related to Environmental Concerns
Structuring an Art Program
Methods of Teaching Art History
Crafts and Ceramics for Art Teachers
Photo Serigraphy
Teaching Commercial Art
Teaching Art Criticism: K-12

Career Education in the Secondary School
Career Education in the Elementary School

Curriculum Implementation in Driver and Traffic Safety Education
Methods and Materials in Driver and Traffic Safety Education

Knowledge and Skills for Teaching Students with Diverse Backgrounds
Teaching the Gifted in the Regular Classroom
Institute for Teaching the Academically Gifted

Teaching the Science, Technology, and Society and Environment Module
Teaching Techniques for Outdoor Education
Laboratory-Oriented Environment Education

Care and Early Identification of Exceptional Children
Contemporary Early Childhood Educational Basis for Curriculum Change
Interrelated Arts
Methods and Applications for Teaching Early Childhood Curriculum
Interrelated Arts in the Classroom: Fall Practicum

Conversational Spanish: Part I
Practical Implementation of Individualized Foreign Language Programs
France Today
Development of LAP's (Learning Activity Packets) in a Foreign Language Program
Conversational Spanish: Part II

Techniques for Early Identification of Learning Problems
Group Counseling Skills
Career Counseling Programs for Counselors
Industry Information and Career Guidance
Personal Counseling Skills Workshop: Module I - Basics

Personal Counseling Skills Workshop: Module II - Group
Peer Counseling

Teaching Nutrition in the Secondary Schools
A Multi-Media Approach for Teaching Home Economics
Current Topics in Home Economics
Crafts in Contemporary Home Economic
Strategies for Teaching Junior High School Home Economics

Life Science and Human Development: K-6
Problems of Drug Abuse
Social Seminar
Family Life and Human Development
Teaching Nutrition in the Elementary School
A Training Program in Human Relations
Hispanic Culture
Transactional Analysis in Education
Afro-American Studies
An Introduction to Interpersonal Skills
Human Rights, Cultural Pluralism, and Human Relations in Education
Women in Today's Society
Transactional Analysis in Education: II
Ethnic Groups in American Society
Black Experience and Culture

Implementation Techniques for County Junior High Industrial Arts Programs
Construction Activities for Elementary School Children
Laboratory Management for Industrial Education Instructors: Safety and Maintenance

Production of Instructional Media
Operation and Care of Instructional Equipment
Instructional Television Methods and Materials
Managing School Media Programs
Film Making
Film Utilization
Introduction to Instructional Television
Strategies for Teaching Media, Research, and Communications Skills
BASIC Language and Methods of Teaching
Computer Assisted Instruction and Educational Technology
Computer Programming Fortran IV

Film Aesthetics
Creative Writing
Literature Programs for Elementary Schools: K-6
Teaching English Language Arts to the Slow Learner: Secondary
Creative Dramatics
Techniques of Language Study in the English Classroom
Improvement of Children's Writing with Attention to Mechanics (Handwriting, Usage, Capitalization, Punctuation, and Spelling)
American Fiction Since 1920
Art of Storytelling
Language Development: Its Relationship to Reading and Writing Skills

Learning Through Language Experience: Creative Writing and Critical Thinking
Organizing Language Arts Learning Centers
Speech Communication
Children's Literature and Story Telling
General Linguistics
Methods of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
Teaching Reading/Language Arts to the Slow Learner
Literature for the Adolescent
Teaching Handwriting in the Elementary School

Manipulative Materials for the Elementary Mathematics Program
Unified Mathematics 7 (SSMCIS)
Diagnosis and Remediation of Arithmetic Disabilities
Unified Mathematics 8 (SSMCIS)
Unified Mathematics 9 (SSMCIS)
Development of a Mathematics Laboratory: Elementary
Problem-Solving Skills in Junior High School Mathematics
Construction of Individualized Learning Packets for Junior High Mathematics
Applications of Secondary Mathematics
Teaching Problem-Solving Skills in Elementary Mathematics
Implementation of the Metric System as the Primary System of Measurement
Implementing a Process Approach to Elementary Mathematics
Teaching Consumer Mathematics

Psychoeducational Assessment and Programming
Individual and Group Counseling
Curriculum Development and Implementation
Behavior Management
System Analysis and Consultation
Teaching Adolescents with Reading Problems
Improving Skills for Teaching Adolescents with Special Needs
Skills for Group Leadership

Guitar Techniques for the Classroom: I
Electronic Music in the Classroom: I
Choral Conducting and Vocal Techniques
Guitar Techniques for the Classroom: II
Electronic Music in the Classroom: II
Class Voice: I
Class Voice: II
Adding Drama to Music Activities
Music for Elementary Classroom Teachers

Program Evaluation Techniques in the Classroom

New Dimensions for the Teaching of Physical Education
Physical Education for the Elementary School Classroom Teacher
Motor Learning Research Applied to the Public School Teaching of Physical Education
Teaching Basic Gymnastics
Prescriptive Teaching for Perceptual Motor Development
Scientific Basis of Athletic Coaching

Basic Movement Education
Folk Dancing for Elementary Teachers
How to Teach Sports Skills: Tennis
How to Teach Sports Skills: Track
Adaptive Physical Education
How to Teach Golf

Problem-Solving in the Classroom
Problem-Solving: Communications Skills
Staff-Student Problem-Solving in the Classroom

Reading/Language Arts Activities
Model In-service:Basic Reading for Early Childhood Personnel
Basic Reading for Elementary School Personnel
Basic Reading: Secondary
An Alternative Method of Teaching Reading
Structured Techniques for Remedial Instruction
Reading Instruction for Children with Specific Reading Disabilities
Skills for Teaching Children with Reading/Learning Disabilities

Quantitative Physical Science I (Physics)
Science in the Elementary School
Quantitative Physical Science II (Chemistry)
Planetarium Astronomy and Astronomy Activities (SCIS - Elementary Science/ Language Arts)
Contemporary Programs in Elementary Science
Progress in Science
The Changing Universe
Teaching Harvard Project Physics

Educating the Motor-Deficient Child
Diagnosis in the Special Education Classroom
Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching
Catch-up Workshop
Language Disability as Related to Special Education
Remedial Techniques and Materials for the Special Education Classroom
Specific Motor Skills Training
The Physically Handicapped Child
Teaching Language Structure to Hearing Impaired and Language Handicapped Children
Education of Visually Handicapped Children
Vocational Goals for the Handicapped (and Their Attainment)
Diagnosis and Remediation of Deficits in Central Auditory Disabilities
Linguistics as Related to Language Therapy
Management of Reading Problems: The Special Education Teacher as a Resource
Sign Language for Teachers
Voice Disorders: Diagnosis and Therapy

Man, A Course of Study
History of Latin America
Survey of Chinese History
History of the Middle East

India, Pakistan, and Bangledesh
African History: South of the Sahara
Concepts and Values in Elementary Social Studies: I
Concepts and Values in Elementary Social Studies: II
Afghanistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka (Ceylon)
Concepts and Values in Elementary Social Studies: III
Geographic Factors in U. S. History
Principles of Economics
Inquiry Techniques in Geography
Issues in the Law

TEACHER COMPETENCY COURSES:

Analysis of Teaching
Preparing Student Objective and Assessment Measures
Supervisory Skills
Teaching Strategies
The Effective Use of Instructional Media
Motivation and the Management of Learning
Parent/Teacher Conference Skills
Designing Effective Instruction

MINICOURSES*:

Effective Questioning
Developing Children's Oral Language
Interaction Analysis
Individualizing Instruction in Mathematics
Organizing Independent Learning
Higher Cognitive Questioning
Effective Techniques for Discussing Controversial Issues
Teaching Skills that Develop Independent Learning in the Upper Elementary Years
Teaching Reading as Decoding
Divergent Thinking

*Produced by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif. For a discussion of the Minicourses, see Walter R. Borg, et. al., The Minicourse: A Microteaching Approach to Teacher Education (Beverly Hills: Macmillan Educational Services, Inc., 1970).

ISTE

REPORT V • PART TWO

The Future

DEFINITIONS AND NEEDS

Howey • Marsh • Rubin

THE FUTURE:
EMERGENT DEFINITIONS AND SOCIAL NEEDS

Kenneth R. Howey
University of Minnesota

Attempts to conceptualize coherent approaches to inservice education or to critically examine the multiple activities which take place under this label have been rare. These papers speak to that void. A number of basic departure points are identified and clarified for those who wish to further navigate the often troubled and muddied waters of inservice teacher training. The authors, David Marsh and Louis Rubin, have participated extensively in the inservice process both as teachers and as teacher educators. In addition, they have studied this undertaking from the more objective platform of the educational researcher. Their considerable experience and unique insights are amply reflected in a number of ways.

Marsh first reviews several current perspectives of inservice teacher education. He analyzes as well some of the common activities reflected in that process. He then presents his own definition of inservice teacher education and cogently defends this perspective in terms of its implications both for more systemic implementation and focused research. Rubin extends upon this work as he looks further into the future in an effort to sort out the labyrinth of societal conditions which impinge upon inservice. He skillfully integrates a variety of future perspectives into a set of working guidelines which, like Marsh's analyses, provides more clarity to the concept of inservice.

In his paper, Rubin reminds us of our rather staggering intellectual and technological potential. He notes the possibility that major breakthroughs in the teaching-learning process could someday be achieved through research in the chemical and biological elements of information storage, methods of autonomic control or the development of interactivity television. His primary focus, however, is on more immediate horizons. He reviews contradictions in society that have not been resolved and which will not only continue but likely

be exaggerated as the dominant issues of the future. The contrasting agendas of the "haves" and the "have nots" and the fundamental differences between the person-oriented and the society-oriented value are but two of the conditions he analyzes that suggest alternative approaches to schooling and teaching will continue to increase. Increased differences in teaching and schooling demand more variation in teacher training. The relationship of teacher training to curricular innovation will continue as a major focus for further study. He concludes his review of current trends with a reminder that in the final analysis it is with the dilemmas of the present that we must begin. This unfinished business includes the problems of training teachers who can better individualize instruction, interrelate formal and informal learnings, and achieve a more balanced integration of the cognitive and affective dimensions of growth. This is to say nothing of our present failure to teach large numbers of youngsters basic literacy and the implications of this condition for inservice training.

Both authors underscore the need for a more sophisticated and substantive empirical base if we are to expect conceptual and operational advances. Rubin identifies the following elements of the larger schooling process as in need of concentrated research: continued emphasis on the concept of interactions, critical examination of those conditions which foster learning outside of school, systematic study of alternative schemes to present structures of schooling, and increased effort to note the stability of desired outcomes over time. Marsh looks at needed research more specifically in the context of training and identifies three major foci: research on deliberate intervention and planned change for teachers, natural patterns of teacher development and change, and the interaction between changing institutions or programs and teachers within those contexts. Marsh goes on to identify existing research in other disciplines which has the potential of furthering our knowledge of inservice teacher training. Both authors also address the matter of cost as well as effectiveness in training endeavors.

Marsh, in reviewing different perspectives of inservice education, notes at least three major orientations: the variety engaged in via personal growth experiences, that achieved by means of professional development activities, and finally that activity related to larger curricular and programmatic efforts. He suggests that a generic perspective of inservice encompassing all of the above activities may have the greatest utility. He outlines how such

basic concerns as financing, teacher motivation, and the relationship of training to teaching can be more fully explored in this broader context. A better balance of formal and informal inservice activities might also be achieved in this comprehensive approach. More exploration of what might be effective combinations of inservice activity is called for.

Rubin, like Marsh, also develops the concept of inservice as an activity which can take place during the school day in close conjunction with ongoing instructional responsibilities. Critical to the success of this or any other inservice strategy is the need for teachers committed to continuing growth. Strategies which better integrate training with daily teaching are but one means to strengthen this commitment of teachers to quality inservice. The authors also address a number of other inservice concerns, such as: the training of trainers, providing multiple incentives for participation, the possible sanctioning of poor teaching performance, and the raising of teacher expectations as a group.

In summary, these two papers provide the reader with an insightful examination of the changing context in which teachers work and of many of the corresponding problems and issues of training which are evolving. The reader is also provided with a framework for thinking through the various components of this multi-dimensional process. Finally, guidelines for how inservice activities might be organized and researched in more coherent patterns are also presented.

RE-EXAMINING THE DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

David D. Marsh
University of Southern California

The issue of in-service for education workers is receiving renewed interest and criticism. Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975) for example, summarize their assessment of the state of the art in in-service education as follows:

> Piecemeal, patchwork, haphazard and ineffective are harsh words we have used thus far in pressing our indictment of in-service education. The words suggest, but do not clearly state, the fundamental problem: There has never been a broad scheme of in-service education with a clear concept of purpose, appropriate undergirding of policy, legitimacy in commitment and fixed responsibility for attaining agreed-upon goals. It is with a broad scheme that we now want to deal; lesser schemes will be too incomplete to work. The broad scheme must include at least four frameworks: conceptual, legal-organizational, design, and support (money, etc.); and all must be seen in context. (p. 16)

They have identified major issues yet to be resolved regarding in-service teacher education. These issues are:

> ... teacher supply and demand; the relationship of pre-service and in-service teacher education; the role of higher education; the role of teachers and teacher organizations; self-governance for the teaching profession; the adequacy of courses, credits, credentials, etc., and the role and purpose of in-service education. (p. 20)

Rubin (1971), in summarizing an excellent set of essays about in-service education, presents a similar critique:

> I should acknowledge at the outset, that I concur with most of the arguments presented by my colleagues: In-service education has indeed been virtually a lost cause. Taken in toto, the conceptions set forth in the previous chapters lead to three fundamental conclusions: teacher

> professional growth has not been taken seriously, it lacks a systematic methodology, and it has been managed with astonishing clumsiness. It is not surprising, therefore, that teachers have grown accustomed to its impotence, and that administrators have come to regard it as a routine exercise in futility. (p. 245)

Rubin (1971) then summarizes a set of important issues presented by the authors of essays in the book.

Joyce (1975) raises a similar set of issues. He poses a series of questions about governance--at the policy level and the delivery level--about cost and finance, about incentives to "make teachers (and professors) love inservice education," and about who will be allowed to be the trainers in such education efforts.

These important issues and questions take on quite a different meaning once we have reexamined our concept of in-service education. If, for example, the scope of in-service education is seen as courses, workshops, and conferences as is often the case, then debates about governance, design, and finance of in-service efforts will focus on one set of specific questions and problems. If, however, the scope of in-service education is seen as being much broader than merely the offering of courses, workshops, conferences, then discussion about all types of issues concerning professional development will focus on other questions and problems.

The purpose of this paper is to develop an adequate definition of in-service education and to reconsider whether the label "in-service education" is the best one to describe these efforts or whether some alternative label such as "professional development," "continuing education" or "staff development" would be more useful. In doing this, the paper will also expand the scope of efforts currently construed as in-service education.

This paper proceeds by first exploring current definitions of in-service teacher education. In explicating these definitions, a number of issues are raised regarding the scope of purposes or end results of in-service education as well as the scope of means by which in-service education can be facilitated. The paper then explores what various writers have said about the purposes or end results of in-service education because these purposes shed additional light on what would be an appropriate definition of inservice education.

The paper also explores the variety of means by which in-service education can be facilitated. This issue is highly relevant to an appropriate definition of in-service education for several reasons. First, efforts in in-service teacher education, in the past, were often limited to the conducting of workshops, courses and mini-courses, etc., even though definitions of in-service teacher education offered no formal or logical constraint against including a number of other highly relevant activities. Secondly, many efforts that had the effect of bringing about professional growth in school personnel were not in the past, nor are they presently viewed as being within the domain of in-service education when in-service teacher education programs are planned, implemented or studied. Consequently, this paper will explore a range of potential in-service education efforts derived from existing practice as well as from relevant literature such as the sociology of the school, organizational development, supervision, and several learning theories. The proposed scope of in-service education purposes and processes are then consolidated into an extended definition of in-service education for school personnel, and the adequacy of the term in-service education is re-examined. Finally, some implications of this definition for planning and implementing in-service education efforts as well as for conducting research on in-service education are discussed.

PREVIOUS DEFINITIONS OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

Several writers offer definitions or indirectly suggest definitions of in-service education of teachers. Edelfelt and Johnson (1975), in the recent publication Rethinking In-Service Education, state:

> In-service education of teachers (or staff development, continuing education, professional development) is defined as any professional development activity that a teacher undertakes singly, or with other teachers after receiving her or his initial teaching certificate and after beginning professional practice. (p. 5)

This definition raises several interesting and important issues. The first is the meaning of professional development. If in-service education is any professional development activity, then we need to ask what professional development actually means, especially when professional development is one of several terms which Edelfelt and Johnson suggest might be used in place of in-service education. Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975) appear to be defining

professional development later in the same book when they state:

> The identification of roles that teachers must assume in teaching--those suggested above or other schemes--can serve as a basic holistic concept and framework for in-service education, most desirably as an extension of pre-service teacher education. If adequacy in performing these roles becomes the goal of in-service education, the goal will then have an operational definition. (p. 17)

Yet other goals or purposes of in-service education have been suggested by other writers. Consequently we will explore the meaning of in-service education later in this paper by exploring purposes for in-service education other than the purpose proposed by Edelfelt and Lawrence above--namely, to perform adequately a variety of teaching roles. Moreover, the definition given by Edelfelt and Lawrence raises the question of whether there is a useful distinction between in-service education, staff development, continuing education and professional development.

The definition also suggests that in-service education can include any activity undertaken by teachers that results in their professional development. This notion is critically important--"any professional activity" could include insights or skills gained while planning or implementing innovative curricula, observing and/or modeling behaviors of other teachers, receiving corrective feedback about one's teaching skills or the success of one's teaching with pupils, and a host of other activities. The significance of this definition is that it frees us to focus on a broader concept of in-service teacher education, rather than a limited and narrow one.

We are not constrained by the definition to focus on what Orrange and Van Ryn (1975) see as activities typically viewed under the general heading of in-service efforts--namely, "sabbatical leaves, graduate courses and master's degrees, continuing education courses, conferences, conventions, workshops, television programs, committee work and one-shot lectures...." (p. 47)

There also is the question of what is meant by "undertakes" in the definition. Does this exclude activities from the definition which resulted in professional growth for the teacher but which were not consciously and deliberately undertaken in the sense of being "intended" by anyone, let alone the teacher himself or herself ?

A revised definition is provided by one of the discussion groups

reported in Rethinking In-Service Education. The group chose to use "professional growth" as their generic term and defined it as "any activity that might improve the effectiveness of educational workers and that incorporates informal or formal settings, is freely chosen or mandated, and is directly or indirectly job related." The author then reports:

> They (the discussion group) represented their definition visually as a cube, the three dimensions of which corresponded to the three aspects of professional growth in the definition--that is, type of setting, degree of choice, and degree of relationship to job. They then observed that the cube provided "a frame of reference for classifying any given professional-growth activity in any given set of circumstances." Also they noted, it contained a segment corresponding to what is commonly called in-service education, but which the (discussion group) called "conscious delivery systems for professional growth related to a given school system, school, or group of educational workers."(p. 72)

This definition is an improvement over the earlier definition. The definition above, however, still has some ambiguities associated with it. For example, it is quite possible that the addition of a new curriculum or a bevy of instructional aides would improve the effectiveness of all educational workers. We are then faced with the question as to whether new staff utilization patterns are to be regarded as "professional development activities."

A third definition of "in-service education" is provided by Van Ryn (cited in Orrange and Van Ryn, 1975) who as Chief of the Bureau of In-service Education of the New York State Education Department adopted a definition that is both prescriptive and descriptive. This definition states that:

> In-service education is that portion of professional development that should be publicly supported and include a program of systematically designed activities planned to increase the competencies--knowledge, skills, and attitudes--needed by school personnel in the performance of their assigned responsibilities. (p. 47)

Aside from the obvious problem of defining in-service education as the portion of professional development that ought to be publicly supported, there is the issue of whether those responsible for in-service education need only increase the competencies of school personnel, as demonstrated in non-classroom settings, or whether "increase the competencies" also means responsibility for overseeing the utilization of these competencies in the school setting. This issue is critically important and is part of a long-standing historical

debate about the nature of and responsibilities for teacher education. To the extent that professional development suggests implementation of competencies in the classroom setting, the very nature of professional development activities, responsibilities, and issues is changed. University faculty, for example, may shudder at the thought that responsibility for the professional development of classroom teachers involves them in the thorny issue of developing and assessing implementation of teacher competencies in classroom settings, rather than merely helping them develop competencies in non-classroom settings. They may see implementation and assessment of competencies in classroom settings as being beyond the scope of their responsibility or ability. Other groups, however, are coming to see implementation as the very heart of in-service education and may argue that it is unwise even to conceptualize in-service education as anything less than implementation of competencies of school personnel.

THE PURPOSES OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

A further perspective on the scope and definition of in-service education is provided by various writers who have written about its purposes. Bottoms (1975) believes in-service education must have at least three purposes, as follows:

> ... to enable educators to acquire the competencies needed to (a) implement educational improvement activities directed toward specific student needs; (b) improve their own or expected goals of professional development, which may or may not lead to higher levels of certification; and (c) meet their own goals of personal growth. (p. 39)

This construct organizes the purposes of in-service teacher education around the ideas of personal growth, professional development, and implementing educational improvement activities. The construct will be used to discuss purposes identified by other writers.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION VIA PERSONAL GROWTH: Professional improvement through personal growth has received considerable emphasis over the last twenty years. For many teachers, a chance to travel and read each summer was an ideal that attracted them to teaching and, in part, a reality that has benefited their teaching. Teachers received salary benefits and, in some cases, advanced credential credit for certain types of personal growth activities

such as trips and graduate courses not immediately related to their teaching. Moreover, professional improvement through personal growth has been the focus of some school-based in-service education activities. Rogers, Combs (1974) and Jersild (1955) have proposed and conducted person-centered in-service education programs. In addition, racial attitude awareness/change programs, which focus on teachers as persons have been tried in a number of school districts. Few other professions have allowed individuals as much time and latitude for personal growth, and have provided incentives for this type of growth, as has the education profession.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION VIA PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A second major purpose of what has been known as in-service education is professional development, which is not synonymous with the implementation of education programs in schools nor with the site-specific roles which teachers play. Several conceptions of professional development help illustrate the scope of possible purposes. Tyler (1975) identifies four purposes of in-service education: remediation, acquiring new technical skills, meeting teachers' own professional growth goals and providing an on-going process of stimulation. Several of these purposes relate to in-service education via professional development. Professional development can be oriented toward one's preparation for jobs other than the job one currently holds. It can also take on the rigor of an autonomous, inquiring "professional" of the type proposed by Thelen (1971), Rubin (1971), Bush (1971) or Jackson (1971), or it can be viewed as the acquisition of powerful generic teaching skills and knowledge which have generalizability to many school settings.

Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975) have suggested that in-service education be organized around roles professionals play. Many of these roles are not site-specific and do not pertain directly to teaching students. Compared to the teacher's role as teacher-of-students, they argue:

> Less attention is given to other roles that a teacher must assume, such as individual professional, liaison with parents, and member of the teaching profession; and almost no attention is given to several roles that a teacher must perform in professional practice--for example, member of a faculty, member of a staff hierarchy, colleague of other professional educators (college and university personnel, state department officials)... and member of a teacher organization. (p. 17)

Professional development is also meaningfully seen in terms of stages in a teacher's career, such as have been conceptualized by Fuller--specifically, a teacher's concern for survival, then for environment, and finally for impact in the school over one's career as teacher.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION VIA EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES: A third set of purposes relate to in-service education as a means to implement educational improvement activities directed toward specified student needs. One could organize in-service education activities around the need to improve the way school personnel function in their current roles in the school. Another approach would be to organize in-service education efforts around the need to implement new programs or curricula in the school. This approach could range from implementing a packaged curriculum to having school personnel participate in the total redesign of the school program. The focus of efforts to redesign the program could be in terms of specific problems or basic purposes of schooling. The approach could be group-process oriented or organized around a structure of school purposes such as the one suggested by Williamson (1971). Put another way, the in-service education efforts could serve as an efficiency system for carrying out current conceptions of teaching and schooling, or they could support fundamental revision of the school program.

THE PROCESSES OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

An additional perspective on the scope and definition of in-service education is provided by examining the wide range of efforts that have been made and/or could be made to help school personnel improve their effectiveness. There are obviously many ways that in-service education takes place and a cross-section of these ways will be presented below.

There are, of course, the traditional approaches to in-service education such as summer sessions or institutes for teachers, off-site university coursework, and on-site workshops or presentations. Occasionally such study has been part of a sabbatical leave for a school staff person.

Working with student teachers is another traditional source of in-service education for regular staff although this activity hasn't typically been considered "in-service education." In working with student teachers,

regular teachers learn new teaching methods and approaches to curriculum design and implementation. They also refine abilities to analyze teaching behavior. While some student teachers and their college-based supervisors provide little stimulation for teachers, other programs like the Teacher Corps are conscious efforts to bring about change in schools via student teachers and related efforts. Corwin (1973) reports that, in some cases, such efforts have been quite successful.

Teachers also participate in developing or adapting new curricula. Such curriculum development or adaptation efforts vary widely in their intensity from very limited efforts to the adoption of comprehensive curriculum/instructional packages such as IPI or IGE. While in-service education has been explicitly part of the implementation of the more comprehensive curriculum/instructional packages, the development of school personnel has been aided in many other ways as well. School staff have been able to visit other schools to see such programs in operation and talk with staff about advantages and problems connected with the program. School staff have also been given technical assistance in implementing such programs, and support of various kinds from the schools and school district authorities.

Professional development can also be facilitated by the natural process of participating on faculty committees or in teaching teams. This process may relate to selecting instructional materials or designing new facilities. Development can also occur in response to a school crisis or problem such as was associated with anti-Vietnam war protests or racial problems in the schools. In some cases this process could be formalized through organizational development activities.

Organizational development trainers have been used and could be used to give the school staff new approaches to identifying and resolving both routine and highly explosive issues as well as to shape group processes in the school more toward organizational growth. Schmuck and Miles (1971) describe and analyze a variety of organizational development approaches such as:

(1) Training or education: procedures involving direct teaching or experience-based learning. Such technologies as lectures, exercises, simulations, and T-groups are examples.

(2) Process consultation: watching and aiding on-going processes and coaching to improve them.

(3) Confrontation: bringing together units of the organization (persons, roles, or groups) which have previously been in poor communication; usually accompanied by supporting data.

(4) Data feedback: systematic collection of information, which is then reported back to appropriate organizational units as a base for diagnosis, problem-solving, and planning.

(5) Problem-solving: meetings essentially focusing on problem identification, diagnosis, and solution invention and implementation.

(6) Plan-making: activity focused primarily on planning and goal setting to replot the organization's future.

(7) OD task force establishment: setting up ad hoc problem-solving groups or internal teams of specialists to ensure that the organization solves problems and carries out plans continuously.

(8) Techno-structural activity: action which has as its prime focus the alteration of the organization's structure, workflow, and means of accomplishing tasks. (p. 9)

While these are approaches to organizational development, they all have a direct impact upon professional development.

Supervision suggests a related approach to in-service education. Included in this category are the assistance and evaluation provided by principals, and/or the assistance given by school-based or district-wide curriculum, special program or instruction staff. Such assistance typically combines instructional materials, demonstrations, and suggestions for staff and curriculum improvement. A similar approach involves a systematic analysis of teacher-pupil interaction or pupil growth in learning which research-oriented groups have explored.

Visits to other classrooms or schools are another means of in-service education. Such visits can provide tips on "how to do it" as well as new conceptions of schooling, instruction and the role of the teacher or student. Finally there are a variety of other informal ways that school personnel have carried out in-service education. Thelen's (1971) personal experience is highly relevant here. In discussing his own professional development as a teacher, he states:

But if in-service training is not to be defined as

a set of procedures to be followed, how can it be defined? At this point I began to recall the experiences I have had that would nowadays be called in-service training, and I soon realized that they are so extraordinarily diverse that no one set of procedures could possibly include them all. But would it be possible to find a common element or essential characteristic that does indeed capture the flavor of in-service training? Let me cite a few of the experiences and then see what can be made of them:

(a) Spending weekends devising laboratory setups that my physics class could use to demonstrate principles for themselves; leading class evaluation of the comparative effectiveness of the setups.

(b) Speculating about new kinds of classroom activities with four teachers of other subjects while our families were picnicking together,

(c) With two other colleagues, inventing and teaching a new experimental teacher-training course, requiring activities to be planned for a three-hour time block each day.

(d) Participating in a faculty interest group to share ideas, to conduct experiments in our classrooms, and to concoct a report for the whole faculty; subject: social sensitivity.

(e) Cooperating with a national project group in trying out their materials, writing out further materials in the same format, and contributing to a national pool of know-how; subject: critical thinking.

(f) Being a teacher of classes observed by researchers; filling out questionnaires for them.

(g) Participating, along with half the faculty, in a special study program planned and led by visiting university trainers; subject: child study.

(h) Attending a teacher's institute series of lectures.

One sees that (a) and (b) together would be characteristic of the autonomous professional; (c) requires a fully functioning team, with interaction at all levels from personal to philosophical; (d) and (e) call for member participation in activities structured by a committee; (f) involves getting some feedback but does not require the intention to do anything better or different; (g) and (h) accept a high degree of dependency and non-involvement on the part of the teachers. (p. 72)

Thelen's (1971) personal experience suggests a variety of informal and formal in-service education activities and the natural blending of these. A variety of informal personal growth oriented experiences could be added to this list as well.

A LABEL AND A DEFINITION FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

A LABEL FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION: We are faced first with the problem of what we shall call in-service education. Recent writers have expressed a discomfort with the label and have suggested alternative labels. The dilemma about a label for in-service education is similar to the dilemma about a label for Teacher Centers which were, and are, also called Training Complexes, Teaching Centers, Staff Development Centers and the like. One leader in the field of teacher centers, B.O. Smith (1971), had this to say about the label "teacher centers:"

> What shall we call them? What's in a name? With a name like mine how could I be concerned. Is it a he or a she, a hare or a jack rabbit, or another Harvey? Does it really exist? Yes, just as surely as Santa Claus exists. What we call this new mechanism for personnel training is not very important. The name of a horse is not what makes him win or lose a race. But all the verbal horseplay aside, some titles may be more appropriate than others. "Training Complex" may be so tied up with the work of the last two years that associations with the name get in the way of thinking in a broader context that now seems demanded. "Teacher Center" will not satisfy those persons who see the center as a place to train administrators, supervisors, counsellors, and the like as well as teachers. "Center For Personnel Development" has been suggested. This title has in its favor the fact that it covers all for whom training is to be provided. It is also readily understood. The designation not only names but also feebly implies what goes on there. I have no special wisdom about what to name the baby. But I do think it should be kept simple and in keeping with common terms. (p. 2)

The issue is similar for in-service education. For in-service education, however, the label has been in use for years and is widely known, but not necessarily appreciated, whereas the label "teacher center" is a relatively new label and idea.

We should ask what we expect a label to do or not do for us. Primarily, a label ought to provide a quick reference to the general field of concern but not necessarily to the specific foci or emphases which any of our pet programs might have within the general field. The label ought to be easily recognized by legislators, school administrators, parents, teachers and others who are concerned or involved in in-service education. The label also ought to name and suggest positive connotations about the whole endeavor and avoid grossly negative connotations which are highly unpleasant for any professional or public sector. Moreover, the term ought to identify but not necessarily prescribe a field of critical basic research, development and conceptualization. This is precisely in keeping with Edelfelt's (1975) call for a "broad scheme of in-service education with a clear concept of purpose, appropriate undergirding of policy, legitimacy in commitment and fixed responsibility for attaining agreed-upon goals." A generic label is needed to provide a label for a broad scheme which Edelfelt sees as including four frameworks: conceptual, legal-organizational, design, and support. It is assumed that all of the above reasons for an adequate label will lead to far more productive assistance given to school personnel.

There are several disadvantages in using the label"in-service education,"as Vanderpool (1975) outlines:

> The point is that if "in-service" education means education "while in or after beginning service," the term is so vague as to be useless. It fails to mark any watershed on this dimension.
>
> If "in-service" means "after licensure," it cannot be applied to those teachers who do not hold licenses: college teachers, private school teachers, private trade school teachers in many cases and many, many others. In some states, "teachers" in publicly supported children's centers "teach" with no license of any kind. The term fails to mark any watershed on this dimension.
>
> If "in-service" is intended to distinguish more sophisticated studies from less sophisticated ones, it also does not serve. What is beginning or preparatory, naive or sophisticated for one is the opposite for another.
>
> There is no definable line between "pre-service" and "in-service." "Pre-service" and "in-service" education are activities on the same continuum. No single point of demarcation can set one off from the other. Many people teach without "pre-service." If

there is no "pre-service," "in-service" becomes double-thick.

> No dimension reveals itself along which use of the term makes consistent and accurate distinctions. Not only that--the term is derogatory, has negative connotations, and fails to point toward constructive future developments. The first task of "reconceptualization" may be to decide to drop the term. (p. 62)

Moreover, as pointed out earlier in the paper, the label "in-service education" has connoted too narrow a range of means by which to assist teachers and aides. Part of the difficulty may be that the term "education" brings to mind a narrower range of options than does "development." For example, Harris' (1969) distinction between in-service education and supervision would not be a problem if both were integrated under the notion of professional development.

The advantage of the term in-service is that it is widely known by both those in the field and among the several relevant publics directly or indirectly affected by it. Moreover, there is no consensus about any alternative label and those proposing alternative labels revert to using in-service education in identifying the general topic. For example, Edelfelt (1975) summarizes a recent book by saying: "A first point of reflection is terminology. I prefer the terms continuing education or professional development to in-service education. That preference develops from arguments like J. Alden Vanderpool's ...," (p. 80). Yet the title of the book became (or remained) Rethinking In-service Education. In a similar way others have called for different labels but referred to the topic as in-service education in their title and introduction. The point of this discussion is to emphasize that in-service education is a widely known term that readily brings to mind the general topic.

In-service education has also served as a generic name for a wide variety of activities. For example, staff development suggests a narrower focus of school-based activities; professional development may suggest a sense of detachment from the school and the need for school improvement; and continuing education sounds too much like the general continuing education efforts of a university. In short, there isn't any alternative term that doesn't have limitations.

Finally, there is a serious cost to be paid in continually revising

the generic name for a topic, and especially in having various groups promoting different generic names. The effort to develop teacher centers was hindered by having different groups call teacher centers by different names. The result was a sense of confusion, and a focus on relatively unimportant differences in terminology rather than on the relatively important problem of developing dynamic conceptions of what teacher centers could be and how to implement these conceptions.

We should continue to use the label "in-service education" as the generic term because (taking a lesson from "teacher centers") the greatest need is for a term that is widely recognized and at least moderately understood. I agree with Vanderpool (1975) that the field needs to be reconceptualized and that:

> Then, a new term should be used for a new concept. ...But there should be no hurry to affix a permanent label because teacher organizations are not yet clear about where they are going: whether toward the traditional union model or toward development of a new model such as that briefly described above. (p. 63)

Teacher unions are not alone in questioning the direction in-service education should or will take. More importantly, however, we need a new conceptual scheme and some broad consensus about which new generic label to adopt before the label should be changed. In short, we are still using the label "in-service education" and it is not the label but the substance of ideas and programs that is important.

A DEFINITION OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION: It is now possible to present a new generic definition of in-service education. The definition describes the boundaries for the general field and is not meant as a prescription for how any in-service program ought to be designed. The new definition follows:

> In-service education is any activity that might improve the effectiveness of education workers through their own development.

In this definition, "any activity" means just that--any activity that meets the constraints of the rest of the definition. It includes not only the courses, workshops, etc. that traditionally have been seen as in-service education, but also activities discussed earlier under the notion of in-service education through personal growth. In-service education through personal growth includes travel, non-job related courses and informal personal

growth activities as well as more formal programs of in-service education which are person-centered. "Any activity" also includes professional development in the sense of the improvement of non-site related professional roles such as member of a professional organization. "Any action" may also mean development of powerful generic teaching skills or abilities which are not site-specific or the development of an inquiring knowledge-based "professional" as opposed to a craft orientation toward one's job. Finally, "any activity" includes activities related to implementing an educational program at a school, or to rethinking a school's purpose or programs.

A complementary perspective in the meaning of "any activity" was provided in the discussion of the process of in-service education above. These processes included work with student teachers and aides in the role of teacher of teachers, implementing or adapting new curricula, and participation in faculty committees or organizational development-type activities. It also included receiving supervision or other feed-back, visits to other classes or schools and a variety of other informal learning activities. This list of in-service education purposes and processes is meant to illustrate but not delimit the meaning of "any activity" in the definition above. "Any activity," then, includes both formal and informal learning activities. These activities can be self-initiated, initiated by others, or happen without "initiation" in the sense of intent on anyone's part that a specific kind of learning take place. The activities can also be either freely chosen or mandated.

The phrase "might improve the effectiveness" connotes that improvement need not take place for in-service education to have happened. This idea is directly analogous to the notion that teaching can take place even if learning does not occur. The phrase "might improve the effectiveness" also allows us to include in-service education activities that intended educational improvement but only led to unproductive change. Such efforts would be called ineffective in-service education and I suspect many school districts in the country could point to many such instances. In-service education efforts do not necessarily have to be successful to be called in-service education.

The effectiveness of in-service education can be seen as many things. Effectiveness is not only improvement in pupil learning of all types but also

changes in the purposes of schools and the roles education workers play in the school. It is also improvement in the way education workers operate as professionals, as opposed to craftsmen, and improvement in handling non-school professional responsibilities. Effectiveness is not necessarily limited to the current jobs of education workers but includes the concept of career ladders and preparation for new education jobs. In short, effectiveness is not a narrow concept.

"Education workers" is meant to include principals, teachers, aides, volunteers, support staff and others when we are discussing in-service education of school-based personnel. It is typically school-based education workers we are referring to when we talk about in-service education. However, there is no logical constraint and there are ample substantive reasons for talking about the in-service education of all education workers whether they currently are in other types of schools, in school district level jobs, at universities or colleges, in research and development labs, in state or federal government jobs related to education. While the definition includes all education workers, the specific group of workers should be identified in any discussion of in-service education.

The phrase "through their own development" at the end of the definition is meant to separate in-service education efforts from related efforts to improve education programs. For example, changes in patterns of staff utilization might double the number of adults in a classroom and because of the increased number of adults, improve the effectiveness of education workers in the sense that pupils are learning more. In other words, anything that makes education workers more effective is not necessarily in-service education. A new set of reading workbooks may help teachers become more effective but the reading workbooks themselves are not in-service education. Efforts to help teachers use such workbooks more effectively by developing a teacher's understanding of the sequence of learning tasks, for example, would be in-service education. A teacher's own experimentation with new reinforcement strategies that help pupils retain material learned in the workbooks is also a form of in-service education.

In summary, the preceding section of the paper has presented a definition of "in-service education" and an argument for retaining the label "in-service education" rather than adopting an alternative label such as "professional development" or "staff development." "In-service education" is

defined as "any activity that might improve the effectiveness of education workers through their own development." This definition resolves many of the issues raised earlier about previous definitions and uses of the term "in-service education." It incorporates the multiple purposes of in-service education as well as the many means by which in-service education can be facilitated. The definition also separates in-service education from related efforts such as changes in staff utilization or the introduction of new curriculum materials.

The label "in-service education" was retained for several reasons. The label is widely known by those in the field and has served as a generic name for a wide variety of relevant activities. Moreover, there is no consensus about any alternative label and even those proposing alternative labels revert to using the label "in-service education" in identifying the general topic. Finally, to shift from "in-service education" to another label could also create a good deal of confusion and could focus attention on the label rather than on the substance of inservice education. Having reviewed a definition for in-service education and its rationale, we can now turn to implications of this definition.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

The definition and conception of in-service education presented in this paper have a number of implications for both practice and research regarding in-service education. The first implication for the practice of in-service education is the need to help practitioners understand and utilize the broad range of means by which in-service education has been and can be facilitated. This paper has described a number of possible activities and a larger number could easily be generated. The problem will be to break down the existing limited conceptions of in-service education as well as to build new programs based on the broader conception of in-service education suggested here. A related issue is the need to utilize combinations of facilitating activities such as training coupled with demonstration, supervision, group inquiry and self-development. In doing this, a balance of formal in-service education also needs to be nurtured. In short, there are a great variety of in-service education activities that have often been neglected or undervalued. Programs of in-service education which utilize combinations of activities need further demonstration and dissemination.

A second implication of the definition is its impact upon current debates concerning issues such as appropriate roles for individuals and organizations in in-service education efforts, motivating teachers to participate in in-service activities, and financing in-service education. If in-service activities include training, demonstration and visitation, supervision, participation on faculty committees and teaching teams, and a host of other activities (both formal and informal), the skills and abilities of in-service educators must be considerably greater than those needed to simply conduct workshops and courses. Moreover, many of these in-service activities can and must take place during the school day and be closely integrated with the regular responsibilities of the staff.

In turn, in-service programs based on combinations of the activities mentioned and with a time schedule that balances in-school and after-school efforts have implications both for financing in-service education and for motivating school staff to participate in such programs. Comprehensive in-service programs, for example, may be less costly because fewer hours of "released time" or "extra duty" pay are involved. At the same time, school staff may find these in-service efforts considerably more helpful, thus increasing staff motivation to participate.

A more urgent set of issues is the need for new policy analysis, research, model-building and development concerning in-service education. There is, first, the policy issue of whether in-service education is worth doing. Let me illustrate my point by taking the devil's advocate role for a minute and raising propositions such as these:

(1) Schools are currently doing a satisfactory job, or alternatively, aren't very critical influences in removing income or other inequalities among citizens. Therefore budget priorities at the federal, state and local level should continue to shift to institutions and priorities other than schools and specifically other than in-service education.

(2) In-service education is not important because the critical problems of schools do not reduce to essentially in-service education issues. Stated a different way, in-service education is not a useful unit of analysis or action for addressing the fundamental purposes of schools, major school programs to achieve such purposes, or even minor reforms to improve existing programs.

(3) In-service education is hopelessly caught in a tradition of sloppy purposes and sloppy programs. Even if the goals of in-service education are very important, there is little prospect that future efforts will be very effective or even politically feasible in the next few years.

Issues like these need to be carefully considered if we are to build a coherent rationale and overall policy perspective for in-service education, or a research base to guide effective practice. A definition and review of the concept of in-service education is a necessary prerequisite to considering these issues and, conversely, one of the first implications of any definition is the need to question whether the definition delimits a meaningful arena for analysis or action. Without providing any answers, I have tried to point to some issues I feel are important.

The definition and conception of in-service education described also has implications for a research base for in-service education. Chin and Downey (1973) discuss three types of knowledge which can be distinguished for the purposes of understanding and fostering research concerning the study of change in organization. These types of knowledge, which can easily be related to a research typology for in-service education, are as follows:

> Type A (which) is basic knowledge focused toward intervention and deliberate, intentional and planned change. It is a set of selectively retained tentatives based on theory and research on how to bring about change, and it has an action purpose.
>
> Type B (which) is the more accustomed basic knowledge focused toward understanding how change occurs, especially looking at changes, their correlates and their consequences.
>
> Type C (which) is the most accustomed knowledge in "basic research." It is focused toward understanding how the functional relationships of parts of a system fit, how the variables are interrelated both causally and especially correlationally. (p. 518)

These types of knowledge are needed in in-service education.

Type A knowledge if applied to in-service education would provide the knowledge for planned interventions in in-service education. It would relate processes to purposes of in-service education. For example, organizational development training, such as the RUPS materials from the Northwest Lab, might be found to be the most effective way to facilitate a redesign of the school's curriculum by the school staff.

Type B knowledge, as applied to in-service education, would help us understand how teachers actually do develop and change, whether this development resulted from intentional change or not. Teachers may change and develop more as a function of their assigned classroom roles than as a function of any training they receive. For example, a teacher participating in a newly established IGE program at a school may change more as a function of participating in this program than as a function of any training concerning individualized instruction or related topics which he/she received. Type C knowledge would help us understand how teachers function in schools and how programmatic or institutional change in schools takes place. Additional insight into how to help school staff develop can be obtained from various learning theories. For example, we could use social modeling theory to examine how teachers learn new skills or attitudes by means of such activities as observing other teachers. We could also use reinforcement theory, along with sociological concepts and insights, to understand how the organization of the school influences teacher behavior so as to retard or promote certain types of development. In short, there is the need to utilize the concepts, generalizations and modes of inquiry from a number of related disciplines in developing the three types of knowledge needed for an adequate research base for in-service education. To date this research base has been sadly lacking; in fact, perhaps no aspect of education has received so much money and effort with so little conceptualization and comprehensive research as has in-service education.

In summary, the definition and conceptualization of in-service education suggests a number of implications for practice and research. Concerning practice, there is the need to greatly expand the range of in-service activities utilized by practitioners and to encourage the use of carefully selected combinations of activities so as to increase the effectiveness of in-service efforts. Such an expansion of the scope of in-service activities implies additional skills and roles for in-service educators. It also implies that many in-service activities may need to take place during the school day and in close conjunction with the regular responsibilities of the school staff. For this and other reasons, in-service education as discussed here may be less costly, or at least have a different pattern of costs, than would in-service programs based primarily on workshops or courses. In addition, it

was suggested that the conception of in-service education presented in this paper may be more helpful to school staff, thus lessening the problem of motivating school staff to participate.

The definition and conception presented here also have implications for research and development concerning in-service education. Having clarified and explicated the definition of in-service education, we were in a better position to question whether in-service education is a useful unit of analysis or action for addressing and resolving major issues which schools face or for improving school programs.

The definition of in-service education also helped clarify three types of research-based knowledge concerning in-service education. The first type of knowledge (Type A) concerns how teachers develop through planned, intentional change. The second type of knowledge (Type B) concerns how teachers do develop and whether this development was planned or not. The third type of knowledge (Type C) concerns how teachers function in schools and how schools, as institutions, change. It was argued that research in these three domains was urgently needed and could benefit from the rich set of generalizations and concepts found in related areas such as the study of innovation, the study of organizational development, the sociology of education, supervision, teacher effectiveness, curriculum development, and learning theory including social modeling, concept attainment and reinforcement.

In conclusion, the definition of in-service education in this paper grew out of an explication of previous definitions of in-service as well as an examination of the multiple purposes and processes for in-service. In-service education was defined as any activity that might improve the effectiveness of education workers through their own development. This definition clearly broadened the scope of activities usually construed as being within the domain of in-service education and suggested a number of implications for practice and research concerning in-service education. It is clear, however, that a good deal more conceptualization, research and improved practice are needed if in-service education is to meaningfully serve education workers.

REFERENCES

Bottoms, G. responsibilities of local school systems, state departments of education, institutions of higher education, and professional organizations for in-service education. In R.A. Edelfelt and M. Johnson (Eds.). Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Bush, R.N. curriculum-proof teachers; who does what to whom. In L.J. Rubin (Ed.). Improving In-Service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Chin, R. and Downey, L. changing change: innovating a discipline. In R.M.W. Travers (Ed.). Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Corwin, R.G. Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1973.

Dreeben, R. the school as a workplace. In R.M.W. Travers (Ed.). Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Edelfelt, R.A. next steps. In R.A. Edelfelt and M. Johnson (Eds.). Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Edelfelt, R.A. and Johnson, M. (Eds.). Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Edelfelt, R.A. and Lawrence, G. in-service education: the state of the art. In R.A. Edelfelt and M. Johnson (Eds.). Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Finch, A. Growth In-Service Education Programs That Work. The Successful School Administration Series. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Harris, B.M., Bessent, W. and McIntyre, K.E. In-service Education: A Guide to Better Practice. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Henry, N.B. (Ed.). In-service Education For Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators. The Fifty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Innovation and Change: A Study of Strategies in Selected Projects Supported by the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems. Cambridge: ABT Associates, 1972.

Jackson, P.W. old dogs and new tricks: observations on the continuing education of teachers. In L.J. Rubin (Ed.). Improving In-Service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Johnson, M. looking back at thinking ahead: 87 educators in session. In R.A. Edelfelt and M. Johnson (Eds.). Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Joyce, B.R. a summary of Dr. Bruce Joyce's address to the California Association of Colleges for Teacher Education as prepared by Carol P. Sezna, Los Angeles: University of Southern California, July, 1975.

Lortie, D.C. observations on teaching as work. In R.M.W. Travers (Ed.). Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Mager, R.F. and Pipe, P. Analyzing Performance Problems or 'You Really Oughta Wanna.' Belmont, California: Fearon Publishers, 1970.

Mann, D. et al, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume III: The Process of Change. Appendix A. Innovations in Classroom Organization and Staff Development. R-1589/3- NEW (App. A). Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1975.

Marsh, D.D., et al. A Study of Teacher Training at Sixth-Cycle Teacher Corps Projects. Volume I. Berkeley: Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, 1973.

Orrange, P.A. and Van Ryn, M. agency roles and responsibilities in in-service education. In R.A. Edelfelt and M. Johnson (Eds.). Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Rubin, Louis J. teacher growth in perspective. In L.J. Rubin (Ed.). Improving In-Service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Schmuck, A. and Miles, M.B. Eds. Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1971.

Smith, B.O. correspondence to Alan Schmieder on June 28, 1971 as cited in Schmieder, A. and Yarger, S.J. Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1974.

Thelen, H.A. a cultural approach to in-service teacher training. In L.J. Rubin (Ed.). Improving In-Service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Tyler, R.W. in-service education of teachers: a look at the past and future. In Louis J. Rubin Ed. Improving In-Service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Tyler, R.W. accountability and teacher performance: self-directed and external-directed professional improvement. A speech given at the Inservice Education Conference sponsored by the University of Illinois. October, 1975.

Vanderpool, J.A. relationships between certification and "in-service" education. In R.A. Edelfelt and M. Johnson (Eds.). Rethinking In-

Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Williamson, J.N. the inquiring school: a study of educational self-renewal (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University). Cambridge: Harvard University, 1971.

THE SOCIETAL FUTURE AND TEACHING

Louis J. Rubin
University of Illinois, Urbana

Every art is subject to its periodic alterations. Some changes are evolutionary, occurring as practitioners discover new and more effective ways of plying their craft. Other changes, in contrast, are adaptive; that is, they occur as external circumstances make readjustments necessary. It is reasonable to speculate that in the years to come, both kinds of changes will have an effect upon the art of teaching.

What we are chiefly concerned with in this paper, however, are the special kinds of adaptive changes which may be demanded by the shifting social scene. To anticipate these changes--at least to the extent that they can be anticipated--several sequential steps are essential. First, we must project, from the most reliable social forecasting data available, probable shifts in the society itself. Next, by analyzing the implications of these shifts, we can approximate corresponding modifications which might be required in the educational system and in the practice of teaching. Once these have been estimated, it then becomes possible to speculate about the re-training activities which can best facilitate the required changes in teaching practice. Finally, extrapolating from these projected in-service training activities, we can, perhaps, judge whether our present mechanisms for accommodating the professional development of teachers' in-service will be adequate.

These steps, to be sure, constitute a relatively complex process and--because of this complexity--one that is subject to error. Yet, the hazards notwithstanding, there is more to be gained from testing the process, and risking partially inaccurate results, than from simply doing nothing. First, the chances are good that the answers we reach will not be entirely wrong, and, second, when miscalculations do happen, later corrections can be

made. It is obvious that the alternative is to once again be caught up in the habitual failure which comes from being too late with too little.

What, then, can be said about the future of society? It is important to observe that every credible futurist is mindful of the follies inherent in prediction. A distinguishing characteristic of social forecasting, in fact, is the frequency with which seemingly plausible projections eventually prove to be wrong. The problem in this regard is not so much that futurologists work with defective crystal-balls; rather, it is that predictions often prove inaccurate because humans are remarkably resilient and--faced with an impending crisis--tend to modify their former behavior. The point is an important one because it may well be that the concept of greatest significance, in anticipating the future of education, is that nothing is certain, pre-ordained, or immutable. Those who make a business of speculating about the human events which lie ahead generally differentiate between short-term (five to ten years), and long-term projections (ten to twenty-five years). Accuracy, obviously, is substantially greater in short-term predictions. For our purposes here, therefore, it is the immediate rather than the distant future that is of greatest interest and concern. Finally, to note one further qualification, speculations about the future society span a vast gamut. Social scientists are concerned with economic trends, population, food and production, and planetary movements. While all of these are of interest, some are a good deal more relevant to public education than others. It is of no particular consequence, for example, from the standpoint of schooling, whether plastic foods are developed by 2010 or 2025. The importance people will attach to their ethnic identity, on the other hand, is of considerable consequence. In the discussion of prospective trends which follows, therefore, primary emphasis is upon those events which will have considerable impact upon the means and the ends of education.

Scenarios on futurity have by now been well-publicized in the media. Humans will unquestionably become increasingly interdependent, and the school curriculum must therefore increase students' global awareness and general sense of worldliness. Similarly, in a society which is bound to be more technocratic, knowledge will continue to constitute a high form of power and vocational skills will become more rather than less sophisticated.

It also seems clear that the ancient contradictions between a

person-centered and society-centered school will be exaggerated. As affluence and leisure combine to spawn a growing interest in self-expression and self-fulfillment, and as special interest groups within the societal organization begin to exploit the political power of education, schools will come to be viewed as agencies which must serve private as well as public aspirations. Since, on the other hand, no society can do without a school system that helps to perpetuate the social order and to transmit dominant values, confrontations and disputes are inevitable.

The unknown, in this connection, which may hold the greatest fascination for social scientists, has to do with the effects of an increasingly self-indulgent, potentially hedonistic citizenry on the social system's productivity. One finds, for example, in contemporary theoretical writing on the politics and administration of education, repeated reference to the school as a powerful vehicle for sustaining the status quo, perpetuating social injustices and inequities and, generally, for serving the needs of the corporate power structure. Irrespective of the validity of these indictments, it seems certain that prolonged debate will rage over the alternative purposes of education.

Prolonged conflict, presumably, will be evident on other fronts as well. As various coalitions seek to serve their own special purposes, as the "haves" seek to counteract the efforts of the "have-nots" to bring about a redistribution of social benefits and resources, as minorities act to neutralize the advantages of the majority, an endless parade of internecine wars will unfold. The resulting implications for education are obvious; the instructional program will need to be realigned so that students gain a good deal more experience in the techniques of negotiation, compromise, and conflict resolution.

It is hardly surprising, under these circumstances, that an old issue has once again risen to the fore. Educators have argued from time immemorial over the capacity of schools to shape society. Reason suggests that if the schools can make their mark upon the values and beliefs of the present generation of youth they (the young people) will be inclined to work toward a healthier and saner social order once <u>they</u> inherit power during their adulthood. Such reasoning, however, has never proved right. Aside from the fact that our ability to influence the values and life styles of students is

something less than potent, many other forces in the out-of-school environment of children also have heavy impact on what they think, believe, and value. Hence, one may conclude that (a) the schools' attempts to overcome the less desirable lessons of the outside world are too feeble and must be strengthened or, (b) such ambitions are akin to an impossible dream and should be abandoned once and for all. At the moment, although nothing approaching a consensus exists, most critics are skeptical regarding the schools' ability to re-make society. Yet, few are willing to argue that all efforts should be completely eliminated. Put another way, for most observers, irrespective of whether schooling can offset the deleterious aspects of other experiences, there is a general belief that it must do all that it can to at least diminish their force.

Not just futurists, but educators, public officials, and parents themselves have also become increasingly concerned about the mood of pessimism which apparently has overtaken the young. While hardly anyone can have failed to note the growing societal malaise, adults tend to be divided into camps of optimists and pessimists. There are those, in short, who seem to have been beset with a sense of inevitable doom and are convinced that nothing can save us from ourselves--and those who, while acknowledging the serious difficulties humankind faces, believe that solutions will be found.

Among the young, however, pessimism seems to have badly out-distanced optimism. There is, as a result, good reason to believe that the schools must seek to rekindle a feeling of combative resilience and a faith in our capacity to solve our dilemmas. More generally, education must do everything possible to instill in students a commitment to the creation of a better society. And, coupled with this commitment, it must also instill a knowledge of how something better can be achieved. What this means, in practical terms, is that the curriculum must, first, familiarize students with the egregious problems that now threaten to do us in and, second, provide cumulative practice in the skills of social problem-solving.

Many observers are convinced that if we are to produce a generation willing to pit itself against the challenge, direct involvement early in the life experience is crucial. They advocate a program of schooling which allows children to carry on a part of their learning in the wider community, away from school, through participation in "social improvement"

activities. Their contention is that such activity nurtures an altruistic spirit, yields direct practice in participatory democracy, and permits a highly desirable interaction between child and adult, as well as between school and community. The more aggressive of such critics, moreover, are quick to argue that time devoted to these experiences will ultimately prove to be at least as valuable as that now spent in classrooms. The virtues of these arguments, of course, remain a point of argument and the feasibility of coping with the logistical problems is uncertain, but the need nevertheless for future citizens who are socially aware, committed, and adept at initiating social change seems unquestionable. In sum, whereas the present instructional program is predominately geared toward individual and societal productivity, the future one must center somewhat more upon the improvement of life.

One cannot help but feel, in considering such admonitions, that--as frequently has been the case--our ability to identify goals and objectives is larger than our ability to define the procedures through which they can be achieved. We are, in fact, a long way from knowing what we must know to effectively educate for the societal tommorrow. A recent Rand Corporation report, entitled How Effective is Schooling, is instructive in this regard:

> We have identified six major issues toward which we believe educational research could profitably be directed. First, research must examine the extent to which, and under what conditions, learning takes place outside the school. Second, the concept of interactions must be more deeply investigated. Third, the vastly different forms of education that have been suggested as alternatives to the present system should be investigated. Fourth, we must begin to examine educational outcomes over time and on many dimensions. Fifth, the approaches must be merged. Each offers insights not available to those who work in the others. Each has blind spots. There have been far too few attempts to use the strengths of one approach to overcome the weaknesses of another. And sixth, analysts must recognize the cost implications of their results.

Because our visions of the future derive from our memories of the past, it is sometimes difficult to reckon with the idea of major deviations from the present way of things. Apart from minor variations and refinements, the teaching-learning process has been relatively constant for the last several hundred years. Some presently on-going experiments, however, suggest

that major breakthroughs in our understanding of the way learning takes place could occur. Should this happen, corresponding changes will, in all probability, be established in our instructional technology. Research in the chemical and biological aspects of information storage efforts to teach children methods of autonomic control, the utilization of drugs to counteract learning impediments, and a possible redefinition of the basic nature of intelligence, for example, could all have an impact upon the future school. While such conceptual discoveries are unlikely for the period immediately ahead, and while a substantial amount of time undoubtedly would need to elapse before the discoveries could be made operational, it is nonetheless of interest to note their possibility.

Life, because it is largely unknowable, has a timeless fascination. Humans have always sought to guess what sorts of things lay in waiting, around the evolutionary corner and when existing difficulties raise our anxieties about the fates which could befall us interest in future survival is even more pronounced. A great deal, consequently, has been suggested in the way of desirable controls against the prospective dangers. It has been argued, for example, that we need a new mix among handicraft labor, modified technologies, and limited heavy industry. It has been suggested that the commune and the neighborhood must become the new locus for individualizing welfare services. It has been contended that we desperately need to fashion a new kind of economic system, wrought out of grass roots control, human cooperation, and the reduction of our present corporate bureacracy. It has been suggested that work must be made a more fulfilling and less exploitative endeavor. And, significantly, it has been recommended that we put an end to compulsory education and initiate a network of folk schools and child-minding cooperatives. The merits of these can only be validated with the passing of time. They are, as a result, beyond the rational scope of responsible school administration. The educational leadership must, instead, restrict its manipulations to problems and to problem solutions which are more understandable, more manageable, and more certain.

The odds are also good that, in the schools of tomorrow, a number of pragmatic alterations will be apparent. For example, substantial use will probably be made of the computer. Present experimentation leads to the inescapable conclusion that the computer can be a valuable ally; hence, it

undoubtedly will be used in monitoring student progress, in diagnosing learning errors, and in prescribing corrective exercises. Computers will be pressed into service primarily with respect to cognitive learning, but they also may be utilized in the storage and retrieval of information on the individual learner's affective characteristics as well. Sustained efforts probably will be made to expand student involvement in planning and selecting learning options. High schools, for instance, will begin to resemble the present structure of colleges. The possibility of interactivity through television, permitting dialogues among students and teachers in disparate locations, may make home-based instruction a reality. Whether students (and parents) will look with favor upon such programs, however, remains moot.

As more is learned about the functions of peer group counseling, and mechanisms through which affective and cognitive learning can be integrated, psychological education for self-knowledge and personal competence may be initiated. It is conceivable, as an illustration, that children will be assigned to a peer counseling group, in the early grades, with which they will maintain continuous affiliation throughout their school careers. The creation of such a structure would presumably provide membership in a kind of surrogate school-family, reduce student isolation, and increase opportunities for the sharing of concerns and problems.

Because of the irrefutable logic inherent in the assumption that no particular approach to schooling can be best for all students--irrespective of their interests, needs, and nature--the present interest in educational alternatives probably will grow. But, whereas current explorations are primitive, future ones are likely to be a good deal more sophisticated. The chances are that in the organization of future schools, alternatives with respect to subject matter, learning method, time and place, all will be available to students within a single instructional facility. The instructional curriculum, in turn, will encompass a body of required study units and an array of options from which students can select. And, while the specifics are impossible to predict, present theoretical thought leads to the conclusion that some form of structural reorganization is probable. Students, for example, may begin with a program in basic skills, perhaps followed by a three-year sequence in arts and humanities or a period of concentrated study in the traditional disciplines. These may be interspersed with segments

of affective education or intensive short-term learning experiences in the community proper. It is here perhaps that matters are most uncertain but, in any event, the limitations of the present K-12 system, necessitating adherence to an invariant format of time and subject, presumably will become obsolete.

It appears that for the purposes of in-service education, it is the unfinished business of the present that must predominate. Our seeming inability to truly individualize learning, our failure to teach substantial numbers of the young to read, our problems in integrating formal and non-formal educational experiences, our need to better integrate the cognitive and affective dimensions of growth and development are of greatest significance.

Turning, finally, to the heart of the matter, any generalizations we make regarding in-service education for the future, logically, must be viewed in the context of in-service education problems in general. All teachers function at a particular level of expertise with respect to technical knowledge and skills. All teachers reflect their personal values regarding the aims of teaching, and all teachers tend to manifest particular strengths and weaknesses. Efforts to design professional growth experiences which prepare teachers for the educational future--with respect to both the method and content of instruction--must therefore begin with the dilemmas of the present. Some students still find their classrooms boring; some continue to be alienated by the seeming lack of relevance; and some remain convinced that school life is singularly unresponsive to their interests and learning preferences.

However, on the reverse side of the coin, many teachers have strong conceptions regarding their own professional goals and therefore seek opportunities to develop and enlarge the particular attitudes and competencies which, in their judgement, are most useful. Hence, while the in-service requirements relating to the future may differ from those of the present, both must be considered in conjunction with one another.

Viewed globally, the major clues for teacher in-service education in the years ahead would seem to embody the following: (1) the need to develop--throughout the curriculum--a high degree of social awareness; (2) the need to develop among youth the skills associated with problem-analysis and

problem-solution; (3) the need to deepen students' understanding of participatory democracy, commitment to its ideals, and a sense of moral and civic responsibility; (4) the need to strengthen students' values and priorities, with respect to personal and public good; (5) the need to instill greater optimism regarding the human capacity to overcome social difficulties and heighten the quality of life; (6) the need to nurture--in every student--a clearer perception of how one's personal future can be shaped.

At first, these objectives may seem amorphous, so vague in meaning as to be practically useless. Or, for the more cynically-minded, they may smack of the platitudes which sometimes are used to define educational intent. Yet, some ideals can only be expressed in imprecise terms, and, despite their imprecision, they can be of considerable use in pointing the way in which we should be moving.

A skillful and imaginative teacher, for example, can do a great deal in the way of expanding social awareness. The lyrics of popular songs, newspapers, contemporary "social commentary" TV programs, and a vast abundance of similar material can be used in literature, social studies, science, mathematics and even career education classes to increase student sophistication regarding family disintegration, drug abuse, the havoc wrought by human greed, and so on.

Similarly, virtually everything we wish to teach can be taught in a problem-solving context. During the recent decades much of the curriculum has become inquiry-oriented. Children have grown accustomed to searching out cause and effect, testing hypotheses, predicting the consequences of particular actions, comparing alternatives, and so on. A good foundation already exists, consequently, for the extension of these procedures into a generally more comprehensive emphasis upon various kinds of problem-solving techniques. What must be underscored, in this regard, is that the point in encouraging children to think about prospective solutions to social problems--and, for that matter, personal ones--is not the quest for workable solutions (although the notions emanating from the minds of children might be better than many which have stemmed from adults) but rather to inculcate a constructive mental set toward problem-solving.

For much the same reasons, life in the classroom must provide a better example of democracy in action. Wherever the subject matter or

school activity permits, learning should sharpen insights regarding negotiation and compromise, as well as provide direct experience in conflict resolution. Through such activities students can learn not only a tolerance for divergent points of view, but a respect for the mechanisms of the democratic process, and--even more fundamentally--a familiarity with what recently has come to be called "people power."

The matter of values and priorities, too, transcends particular areas of the curriculum. Issues regarding priorities have become crucial because, whereas in the past the human problem was to choose between right and wrong, in the future we likely will need to make infinitely more difficult choices between two conflicting "rights." Hence, the curriculum must provide routine exercise in choice-making--in effect, a special form of problem-solving. Moreover, since the need to choose is in itself often anxiety-provoking, there are emotional as well as intellectual dimensions involved. The need, therefore, is for instructional activity which helps students to formulate healthy values, to translate these values into moral judgements regarding personal and public priorities, and to minimize the emotional tensions inherent in this type of activity.

The restoration of optimism and the re-invigoration of social spirit, obviously, are particularly relevant to the final years of high school. The cumulative fashioning of students' personal images of the future, on the other hand, can be worked upon from the middle years onward. Both objectives, plainly, are related to the humanistic aspects of instruction. As in the case of the other pursuits, consequently, they can be fused with substantive instructional content across the curriculum.

If, in the time to come, teaching becomes increasingly specialized, the organization of in-service education for the future will take one direction. But if the move toward specialization is resisted, it will be necessary to organize events so that a multiplicity of requirements can be dealt with simultaneously.

Given this collection of short-range teaching requirements for the period immediately ahead, the key question then becomes: Can the present system of procedures accommodate the needs?

Teacher in-service education, historically, has never amounted to very much. Davies has synthesized the situation in one terse sentence: "In-

service teacher training is the slum of American education--disadvantaged, poverty-stricken, neglected, psychologically isolated, riddled with exploitation, broken promises, and conflict." Again and again, a useful innovation has been dissipated at the door of the classroom, simply because we have failed to prepare the teacher to use it intelligently.

For the most part, teacher in-service education has been a kind of massive spectator sport. The typical program lacks vitality and focus. What is known about modifying human behavior goes largely ignored. Teacher incentive is scant. The outcomes of retraining, not surprisingly, are generally poor.

Successful teaching is dependent upon a number of distinct skills. Teachers differ markedly in the extent to which these have been mastered. Their retraining needs, accordingly, are far from uniform. Yet, we lack ways to individualize retraining with reasonable economic efficiency.

Moreover, all parents do not have the same expectations of their schools; all children do not learn in the same way; all learners do not have the same abiding concerns. Thus, the teaching of eighth grade history must vary according to the situation--it often needs to be of a different order in two classrooms of the same school. We therefore must have methodologies through which we can assist the teacher to accomplish a specific task, in a specific situation, with a specific kind of learner. In short, we must devise programs which make it possible for the teacher to function in the environment and subculture of the particular school.

Present in-service training programs usually take one of four forms: (1) expository exhortation, either spoken or written, through which teachers are implored to utilize a particular method, emphasize a particular set of ideas, or accept a particular set of assumptions; (2) demonstration teaching in which an expert demonstrates a teaching method with students; (3) supervised trials in which teachers attempt to use a specified teaching method, or teach a prescribed lesson, and are then subjected to critical appraisal; (4) performance analysis in which the classroom actions of teacher and students are recorded and reported to the teacher so that an analysis of error can be made. Since teachers are subject to individuality as are all other humans, responding differentially to training stimuli, and since the appropriateness of a training method varies with the task at hand, teacher retraining must be multilateral rather than unilateral. We need systems which permit us to

integrate a variety of training devices within the same program.

We have tacitly assumed that a supervisor, a principal, or a college professor--as a privilege of ordainment--is able to train teachers in whatever skills or strategies are needed. This assumption, of course, is unreasonable. If we are to exploit the potential of staff development programs to promote useful educational change, three things must be considered. We must develop an effective training methodology; we must train "trainers" to use the methodology; and we must help those who judge teachers and who measure their effectiveness understand and value the goals of the training.

Our attempts to improve teacher in-service education are still hampered by a lack of systematic theory. In the absence of such theory, it is difficult to build efficacious procedures. To accomplish effective teacher growth we need to help teachers to develop tested techniques, and to gain insights that will ultimately make them self-sufficient in solving their own instructional programs. The teacher must know both what to do and why to do it.

When the issues of teacher retraining are debated, there often is a mythical belief that better training will, in and of itself, produce better teaching. The fact is that few teachers function anywhere near their optimal capacity--neither, for that matter, do most administrators and researchers. If teachers can already teach better than they are now teaching, how can we improve matters if we increase capability but not incentive? Respectable experiments have demonstrated that teaching performance is substantially improved when the grounds for reward are made explicit and when tangible pay-off actually occurs. Two pertinent provisions must therefore be put into widespread practice. First, schools must reorganize their system of staff deployment so that perhaps ten percent of the teachers are free for retraining at any given time, and, second, schools must begin to invoke sanctions against poor performance and offer rewards for good performance.

Because of the great difficulty in measuring the results of teaching, administrators tend to make little effort to distinguish the pedagogical strengths and weaknesses of each teacher. Moreover, improved performance in the classroom normally does not result in any direct recognition for the teacher. While most teachers, of course, have a genuine desire to teach as well as they can, their motivations frequently are distilled by a variety of personal and organizational factors. As a result, the typical teacher does not

find it imperative to increase competency through continued professional development. Even where the training program is of high quality, teacher incentive may be low. Teachers usually adjust their labors to the standards of their faculty group and perform at the particular level required for survival in the system. As a consequence, retraining programs must, among their other obligations, raise group expectations.

A passage from an earlier writing may serve to convey the spirit of the correctives needed to cope with the problems of in-service education:

> If there is to be significant improvement in education, the nation's teachers as professionals must manage their own intellectual growth. They must, in short, have an improvement program which allows them to advance their professional artistry.
>
> The program must first acknowledge that the competence and zeal of the teacher are far and away the single most important factor in quality instruction. Teachers are individuals who differ tremendously in strengths and weaknesses, in intellectual backgrounds, and in responsiveness to their teaching situation. Yet we tend in our teacher education efforts to treat them in clusters. The difference between teaching which is routine and teaching which is inspired depends to a large degree upon the teacher's own sense of motivation and commitment. The desire to change, if it is to be consequential, must come from within the individual. Mediocre teaching can distill and even pollute the value of everything that goes on in the classroom. Nothing that we invent in the way of content or method will be worth very much unless it is used competently. In-service education should not be, as it has sometimes been, merely another theatre for puppets. It should set a stage for growth--but in the tradition of the comedia dell' arte, where actors did not memorize, but improvised their lines.
>
> The teacher functions in a school environment that is often antithetical to his improvement. The educational community has, upon occasion, behaved as if teachers were essentially pawns acting out the genius of someone else. Teachers have been inundated with prescriptions for proper pedagogical behavior. The profession, let it be said, has not been oblivious to these problems. Men and women of unquestioned ability and of strong commitment to better education have worried about the growing danger that change will be prized for its own sake.
>
> Because it is virtually impossible to teach a class so badly that no learning takes place, survival has been easy, but the price of ease has been the inhibition of experimentation. Indeed, the forces that have argued against disturbing the status quo have probably overpowered those which have argued for seeking a better way. Because we have, moreover,

> never been too clear about the delicate balance between the artistic and scientific aspects of teaching, nor about the balance between teaching individuality and the need for consistency and unity in the school, our tendency has been either to leave well enough alone, or to impose innovations on the school, shifting colors from year to year like a seasonal change in fashion.
>
> In sum, the present scene is characterized by a dangerous tendency to change haphazardly, with little regard for the understanding and sophistication of the practitioners who must sustain the change, and by a tendency to disregard the teacher's right and obligation to be captain of his or her professional soul. We have become preoccupied with the achievement of visible differences without adequate concern for the internal restructuring within the system--and within the individual teacher--upon which such overhaul depends. We need a method and a program that will ensure rational change, that will generate a professional growth in the teacher as a necessary precondition to better schools, and that will make possible the utilization of on-going research in a sensible manner.

What then can be said about the need for restructuring teachers' professional growth?

The problem, distilled to its essence, is simply that the traditional devices of in-service education--the workshops, the one-session inspirational meetings, the district committees--have in the main had limited effect upon the teaching body politic.

What is needed is a strategy of in-service education that can overcome the chronic obstacles and, concomitantly, can offer at least some preparation for the inevitable changes of the future. The chief hurdles are familiar themes: in-service education is no different from education elsewhere and the learner is subject to the usual elements of attitude, incentive and purpose. The curriculum has always shifted in piecemeal fashion and the immediate future gives promise of even greater fragmentation and disjointedness. We cannot conceive of the classroom teacher in any one image or mold, but must cope with an almost infinite variety of professional profiles that differ in both degree and kind. It follows, therefore, that any workable strategy must concern itself with the matter of motivation, with provisions for overcoming the harms of fragmentation, and with procedures which facilitate the individualization of teacher retraining.

In-service education is not merely something which is done to teachers; it can be also be something which teachers do to and for themselves. If we can

meet the demands of motivation and provide the substantive wherewithal for self-directed development, we can perhaps achieve the larger objectives of in-service growth and, in concert, aid and abet the transition to the future. Most importantly, we can exploit the teacher's capacity for uniqueness, for initiative, and for the joys which derive from cooking one's own soup. This is not to say that traditional in-service techniques ought to be abandoned, or that growth cannot be nurtured through a group process. It is rather to suggest that such efforts should be amplified through stratagem which supply connective tissue to individual teachers, to their private strengths and weaknesses, and to the specific concerns they carry.

The inescapable fact is that realistically the curriculum is what takes place after the teacher closes the door and starts to teach. The abiding danger is that we shall forget that technique and content ought to direct each other and in-service training will become a matter of putting new material in the teacher's briefcase. At the heart of our strategy there must be a profound concern for things which give rise to an intensely motivated effort, a personalized preoccupation with the yet unattained, a continuing quarrel with the senseless and ineffectual, and an unfettered inventiveness in style and approach.

From a tactical standpoint several observations are appropriate. We shall not get far unless someone in the school unit is given responsibility for a significant program of staff growth, and unless this person is an imaginative and skilled entrepreneur. Moreover, we cannot indefinitely continue to beg the question with regard to incentive. We are asking, after all, for a giving up of the easy for the better, for a yielding of the familiar for the unknown, and for the plain exertion of effort beyond what is necessary for professional survival. We must in turn give something--whether monetary compensation, or prestige, or even perhaps the simple freedom to pursue one's own bent. Beyond this, we must also give time. So long as the accomplishment of our purpose must be subsidized by time stolen from the teacher's golf game, stamp collection, or literary browsing, progress will be slow. Our profession, to be sure, is not without its dedicated souls, but even dedication is exhaustible.

In its simplest sense, teacher in-service education seeks three ends: (1) the extension of knowledge in general and pertinent subject-matter knowledge

in particular, (2) the acquisition of new techniques of teaching; and, (3) a shaping of attitude and purpose. The ends are neither mutually exclusive nor alien to the crux of a curriculum for the future. An in-service program for a chemistry teacher, for example, should add knowledge of the world as well as of chemistry. It should familiarize the teacher with methods and materials to which he/she has not previously been exposed, and, ultimately, it should help define his/her perception of the important, and the sense of mission. Their realization lies in the things teachers read, in the meetings they attend, in the conversations they have with colleagues and experts, in their testing of new methods, and in the careful analysis of the results. Toward these ends, as in love and war, so to speak, all is fair.

The suggestions for an operational scheme which follow are the same for a district of one school or one of fifty schools. Size establishes problems of organization and procedure rather than of operational strategy. The scheme is intended, furthermore, as a tentative model rather than as a fixed prescription. Local administrative leadership can tailor the structure to the particular setting which exists. The principal components of the strategy are as follows:

(1) Each teacher must be made to recognize that he or she plays a crucial role in curriculum improvement; namely, to assess the shortcomings of the existing program, to better it through one's own experimentation, and to test the value of improvements suggested by the research of others.

(2) Each teacher must guard against complacency, seek to manage personal artistry, be governed by personal insights, and draw systematically, from the aggregate resources, whatever will most improve performance.

(3) Each teacher must have the requisites of time and materials so as to be consistently informed about new developments, and to select intelligently from alternatives, and each must make periodic judgments regarding the adequacy of instructional outcomes.

(4) Each teacher must have recourse to the special kinds of technical assistance which he or she specifies, whether in the form of expert consultation, time for cooperative endeavor,

opportunity for skill mastery, or provisions for theoretical study.

(5) The task of leadership is to set forth expected in-service accomplishment, to provide the wherewithal for its achievement, to unshackle the individual teacher from those aspects of organizational life that are restricting, and to evaluate the end results.

The substance of the strategy lies in its emphasis on the individual, matching idiosyncratic preparation with what is a most idiosyncratic art; in its systematic provision for overcoming the pitfalls of fragmentation; and in its demand that the nature of in-service activity be determined by the teacher's particular objective at the particular time. While the shift from mass programming is admittedly difficult, the end gives promise of justifying the means.

With respect to the educational future, in-service can anticipate problems on the horizon, but it cannot anticipate too far in advance. Thus, in-service is best advised--as it copes with the present--to focus upon whatever future provisions promise to have relatively immediate utility.

ISTE

REPORT V • PART THREE

Social Contexts

Boyer • Ashworth • Brizzi • Whiteman

PROFESSIONALS IN THEIR SOCIAL CONTEXTS

James Boyer
Kansas State University

The three position papers in this section all speak to general important issues in inservice training as well as to the task of designing diverse programming which will include those cultural identities which have been so neglected by our system of education. Each paper approaches the task from a different standpoint: while Ashworth provides detailed descriptions of the language used by both social scientists and professional educators regarding the "deficit model," Whiteman lists five minimal competencies needed by teachers of the American Indian, and Brizzi describes the pilot program of a specific school citing the components which are functional in that setting and make that program work.

Culturally diverse programs for public education are definitely addressed by all three papers at a general level but they stop short of principles for future programs. While all three papers have much to contribute, I do not agree with everything they say. Ashworth, for example, actually apologizes to those teachers who were born with a silver spoon in their mouths, suggesting that they have an irremedial deficit. While her position that the well-to-do have cultural blindnesses and handicaps is valid, her hard-line stance actually places a psychological penalty on those teachers who come from economically able families. Such a practice is equivalent to penalizing a learner because the learner is either Indian, Black, Mexican American, or White, or economically poor. Human adaptability makes it unnecessary for severe penalties within the educational context for cultural minorities and "mainstream" American teachers alike.

The Brizzi paper demonstrates a knowledge of the multiple facets of a school site which, for all practical purposes, is a "demonstration center"

reflecting the positive aspects of bilingual instruction, multi-cultural impact and imaginative resources, both human and otherwise.

All the papers reflect a basic knowledge both of the availability of federal funds for programming and of litigation affecting multicultural inservice efforts (litigation over desegregation-related concerns and others associated with discriminatory behavior in our society). For example, Brizzi lists several incentives designed to provide for flexibility in programming and for community support, but these are not analyzed at a level permitting us to induce generalizations.

Whiteman lists five comprehensive competencies which she believes are minimal for the teacher of the American Indian. Inservice programs would certainly do well to begin with the specification of outcomes (competencies, proficiencies, behaviors) and this is technically sound as an approach, but she does not make clear how to use these objectives to guide the components of an inservice training program. The competencies are:

(1) eliminating stereotypical thinking on the part of teachers;

(2) recognizing cultural homogeneity on the part of America and on the part of Indians particularly;

(3) identify resources of local tribal culture and employ them in implementing the curriculum;

(4) utilizing Indian-oriented materials in teaching and doing so with integrity and without bias;

(5) knowledge of the vast linguistic variations among the Indian-Native American community.

Each of these appears to be sound, but they come from a general philosophical base and require the teacher to internalize that philosophy as these competencies are acquired. Greater attention might have been given to that philosophy.

Brizzi's document expresses enthusiasm about the program in the Allendale school but one wishes that she had described the resources used more completely. For example, she mentions higher education personnel as a resource but does not indicate the actual relationship of the higher education personnel to the program. It is assumed that they would function most effectively with the teaching-administrative staff through inservice activity--but this is not clarified. They might also function as demonstration teachers or exemplars of cross-cultural teaching and learning. They might further serve as identi-

fiers of particular materials appropriate for such instructional activiy, or they may merely function as members of advisory boards or parent-teacher organizations.

Ashworth synthesizes several famous pieces of literature which have had much publicity and wide circulation. By her own acknowledgement, these reflect the deficit model of teacher/social scientist thinking. Her inclusion of it, however, gives it further visibility at the descriptive level and provides even greater numbers of people to adopt it as a style of thinking. There was little or no reference to the literature which refutes such a model or to the literature which was authored by members of the groups whose backgrounds are different and/or whose racial, ethnic, cultural identity might be different. (Her reference list includes very little of the professional literature written by Black Americans or by Mexican Americans, for example). Hence, Baratz and others are further disseminated. While some reference is made to opposing literature (Billingsley, p. 4), the declaration of such alternate viewpoints seems limited.

On the more positive side, however, the authors all seemed socially and morally committed to the task of improved curriculum/instruction experience for children. The Ashworth paper title is distinguished by its reliance on adjustment by the teacher rather than by the learner. This is an important contribution to the thinking of professionals. The Whiteman paper describes specific tests and activities which might be included in a training sequence. These factors represent strong commitment to programmatic change and are seen as major assets to much of proposed teacher training. It should be remembered, however, that multi-cultural curriculum effort requires adjustment/change on the part of both the learner and the teacher.

SUMMARY

All three authors reflect a basic understanding of the complexity of inservice effort in American public education during the "critical seventies." Their tasks were not easy and as they function in teaching or teacher-training, they have seen instance-after-instance of inappropriate effort to solve the problems of learning and teaching in a complex society.

Perhaps further analysis and communication between and among observers and doers such as Ashworth, Whiteman and Brizzi will bring us closer

to a viable approach to the multi-cultural inservice reality so sorely needed in this decade.

HELPING TEACHERS ADJUST TO STUDENTS WHOSE BACKGROUNDS DIFFER FROM THEIR OWN

Margaret C. Ashworth
Wayne State University

> Education, in the eyes of most, has to do with curricula, with methods, with administration, with teaching. It is my contention that tomorrow's educator, whether the humblest kindergarten teacher or the president of a great university, must know at the deepest personal level, the stance he takes in regards to life.
>
> from Carl R. Rogers, Freedom to Learn

> The clash of cultures in the classroom is essentially a class war, a socio-economic and racial warfare being waged on the battleground of our schools, with middle-class and middle-class-aspiring teachers being provided a powerful arsenal of half truths, prejudices and rationalizations, arrayed against working-class youngsters.
>
> from Kenneth B. Clark, Address

Inherent in the topic "Helping Teachers to Adjust to Students Whose Backgrounds Differ from Their Own" is the idea of change: an effort to make someone fit or conform, or to bring about some predetermined satisfactory result. Also implicit in the topic is the idea that teachers should or will change, but it has been my experience that most educators have focused change on the students and not on themselves. Educators have been unwilling or unable to determine just what kind of changes are necessary with the exception of the generally held notion that the child or his/her home environment, his/her culture or his/her life-style are strange and different. The child's cultural difference from the teacher and not the teacher's cultural difference from the child has been viewed as a deficit which needs changing. The Euro-Anglo model has been accepted as sacrosanct, and school programs and policies are built on

this sanctity.

From their undergraduate preservice days to their inservice experiences teachers have been inundated with literature replete with the following assumptions, concepts, and value judgments which categorize blacks and other minorities in the following ways:

(a) The differences in race and culture represent a deficit; therefore, they must be changed to fit the acceptable northern European model.

(b) Those children whose families have not been exposed to higher education are themselves ill-equipped to succeed at the intellectual level required for business, industry, the professions or any mainstream endeavor.

(c) The teaching strategies most effective for "those" children are those heavily dependent on rote memory, as these children have cognitive deficiencies.

(d) These children are unable to conceptualize.

(e) A one-parent home in a culturally different community lacks the ingredients necessary for school success.

Unquestioningly many teachers have accepted social scientists', educators', and policy makers' stereotypic characterizations of the culturally different child as the only view of all minority group children. Even though these characterizations may be ascribed to any child, teachers have been told repeatedly:

(1) The minority child does not have a father in the home.

(2) The community is so deprived the child won't be able to learn much no matter what the school does.

(3) Middle-class goals are not open or applicable to the majority of the non-Anglo pupils.

(4) The pathology of lower-class children's life styles precludes integration into middle-class styles.

(5) They belong to a "culture of poverty."

(6) They are biologically inferior.

(7) They are intellectually inferior.

(8) They lack motivation.

(9) They seek immediate gratification and cannot defer immediate pleasure and plan for the future.

(10) They are slow, dull, lazy and non-verbal.

(11) They lack intellectual curiosity.

(12) They possess weak self-concepts.

(13) The black family's linguistic incompetence is indicative of its inferior intellectual capacity.

Two points, however, are not told to teachers. First, not all minority group children have all of these characteristics, and second, many minority group children have none of these characteristics.

These assumptions represent the "deficit theory" with respect to poor and minority groups. Referring to the deficit theory which has led to many education programs such as Head Start and Follow Through, Stephen and Joan Baratz argue:

> ...Negro behavior is not as it is, but rather as it deviates from the normative system defined by the white middle class. The postulation of such a norm in place of legitimate Negro values or life ways has gained ascendance because of the pervasive assumptions (1) that to be different from whites is to be inferior and (2) that there is no such thing as Negro culture. (1)

I believe that Charles Valentine's statement is the appropriate perspective on the deficit theory:

> Anthropological training and experience, plus more than a passing acquaintance with the psychological and sociological literature on Afro-Americans, convince us that the deficit theory is largely undemonstrated. Any theory of class or racial deficits of biological origin is quite undemonstrable, indeed scientifically untestable, in an ethnically plural and structurally discriminatory society. The necessary separation of biological and socio-cultural factors is methodically impossible in this setting. Writings which put forward bio-chemical genetic determination, or social selection in the evolutionary sense, as explanations for group differences in behavior must, therefore, be dismissed as pseudoscientific nonsense. (2)

Follow Through, a social experiment approved by Congress in 1967, and directed at kindergarten through third grade children who had been in Head Start, has recently been evaluated. Serious questions are being raised as

to the value of such programs in view of the enormous investment of the taxpayer. The General Accounting Office, a congressional auditing agency, reported that from 1967 to 1974, $300 million had been spent to provide special math and reading instruction and health and food services to 71,000 poor children. Benefits commensurate with such an expenditure have been difficult to prove.

Stephen and Joan Baratz have described the reasons so many compensatory education programs such as Head Start and Follow Through have had little clear impact. They feel that compensatory education is usually based on an erroneous deficit theory. Instead, they argue, education should begin with the child's own culture and help the child to acquire new patterns that do not necessarily replace his/her original cultural patterns:

> The early childhood programs, as well as public schools fail in the long run because they define educability in terms of a child's ability to perform within an alien culture, yet they make no attempt to teach him, systematically, new cultural patterns so that the customary initial spurt in test scores can be maintained. Educability, for culturally different children, should be defined primarily as the ability to learn new cultural patterns within the experience base and the culture with which the child is already familiar. The initial test scores of culturally different children must not be misevaluated as evidence of "educability" but rather should be viewed as evidence of the degree to which the child is familiar with the mainstream system upon which the tests are based both in content and presentation.
>
> Because of the misconception of educability and misevaluation of the test data, interventionists and educators create programs that are designed (1) to destroy an already functionally adequate system of behavior because it is viewed as pathological and (2) to impose a system of behavior without recognizing the existence of a functionally adequate system of behavior.... Education for culturally different children should not attempt to destroy functionally viable processes of the ethnic culture, but rather should use these processes to teach additional cultural forms. (3)

Many educators and some social theorists would have us believe that there are vast and significant differences in the experiences or backgrounds of the minority children in public school classrooms and the early experiences of their teachers. My contention is that there are more similarities than differences. The problem seems to be that educators, including teachers, have extremely short memories. They are quick to blot from their minds their personal struggles up the educational ladder and forget the many

sacrifices of their parents and grandparents. People seem to prefer to believe the myth that they made it because they are different from and more capable than the average individual.

Children, regardless of their socioeconomic backgrounds, are human beings who need love, acceptance, a feeling of worth, and a right to justice and equal opportunity. The teacher who begins with this view of humanity will concern himself/herself with superior performance, with excellence and with skill. Thus, no different strategies will be needed to teach the culturally different child than those needed to teach the child of the "mainstream" family. The culturally different child is often bicultural and is able to handle the two cultures extremely well. Thus the problem lies with the teacher's perception of himself/herself and his/her students. Essentially, acceptance of self and one's students will lead teachers to a multicultural approach to education.

Multi-ethnic curriculum planning should be viewed as a process which includes all personnel affected by the changing curriculum and should be organized using an interdisciplinary approach. All teachers in all subject areas are key participants in the process. In our experience, the more involved administrators, students, parents and community representatives become in the process, the better the chances for success of a multi-ethnic studies program using teacher education programs, public school staff development efforts and community resources. The general goal of a multi-ethnic program should be to develop innovative and imaginative programs that will help individuals understand and appreciate our society's cultural diversity in order to live more peacefully and work effectively with people of various socio-economic, ethnic and minority groups.

Any pre- or inservice teacher training program which does not help a teacher focus on such problem areas as cross-racial interaction and friendships will fall considerably short of its goal. Training or retraining of teachers is crucial because there is no empirical data which suggests that the busing of children to achieve some mythical racial mix will assure any meaningful improvement in education. Busing is but one tool to reach the goal of equality under the law that was the basis of the landmark U.S. Supreme Court Decision Brown v. Board of Education:

> Our decision...cannot turn on merely a comparison of these

> tangible factors in the Negro and white school involved in each of the cases. We must look instead to the effect of segregation itself on public education.
>
> Full implementation of these constitutional principles may require solution of varied local problems. School authorities have the primary responsibility for elucidating, assessing, and solving these problems. Brown v. Board of Education, 349 US 294, 299 (1954).

In reviewing particular situations, the Supreme Court has directed District Courts to:

> ...consider problems related to administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, revision of school districts and attendance areas...They will also consider the adequacy of any plans the defendants may propose to meet these problems and to effectuate a transition to a racially non-discriminatory school system. Brown v. Board of Education, 349 US at 300-301 (1954).

In other cases the court has upheld its decision to desegregate schools. For example, where a school board contended it was not obligated to afford certain curricular opportunities to black students during the pendancy of a desegregation order because no inequality of curriculum was alleged in the complaint, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals responded:

> While the plaintiff's complaint did not allege that the quality of the teaching or curriculums of the segregated Negro schools was inferior to that provided by white schools, the point under discussion was urged and considered and relief from such inequality could be provided under the complaint and prayer for general relief. Mapp v. Board of Chattanooga, 319 F2d 571, 577 (1963).

In a second case, in response to the contention that the court was unwarrantedly interfering in internal district affairs, the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit upheld an "expansive bilingual-bicultural plan" to insure meaningful education opportunity. Serna v. Portales, 499 F2d 1147 (CA:10, 1974)

Due to the abdication of the duties invested in state boards of education and local school boards, the courts are continuing to play a significant role in bringing about needed changes in public education. A third case is the recent ruling of Judge Robert DeMascio in his August 1, 1975, desegregation order. In addition to pupil reassignment, the Order included eleven education components. They are as follows:

(1) Inservice Training for all School Employees

(2) Non-discriminatory Testing

(3) Guidance and Counseling

(4) Bilingual/Bicultural Education

(5) Community Involvement

(6) Students' Rights and Responsibilities

(7) Co-curricular Activities

(8) Faculty Assignment

(9) Reading Program K-12

(10) Pupil Reassignment

(11) Monitoring of the Court Order by a Court Appointed Commission

These components are being developed by school staff and representatives from the community. Their implementation dates will be determined by the Court. Effective, committed leadership in each of the areas has the potential of revolutionizing the urban education system during the latter part of this decade.

SUMMARY

In view of the ever increasing problems in public education and the attendant decline in public confidence in the institution, we cannot afford the luxury of apathy or complacency. We must devise strategies which allow new and innovative ideas to surface.

The thoughts advanced in this paper are not intended to point the finger of blame at any one actor in the drama, but, rather, to suggest that the script be carefully examined and that the scenery and the props perhaps be considered inappropriate.

If education is to serve this nation as a bolster or reinforcer of our democratic institutions with the avowed commitment to justice, freedom and equality, it must reject the role which perpetuates classism and facism. Educators who are unwilling to question and to criticize the status quo are

undeserving of the responsibility for developing the minds of our youth.

Ryland W. Crary in "Humanizing the Schools" states the obligation of the school:

> ...The school must regard the human worth of each child (emphasis added) as its full trust. Nothing less than full commitment to each child is its burden, and failure in this intent is betrayal.

Thus, my thesis is: There are no intrinsic special problems for teachers who relate to the poor or the culturally different. Children are children and our society is multicultural. Success depends on the teacher having a strong self-concept and willingly accepting cultural pluralism.

REFERENCE NOTES

(1) Stephen and Joan Baratz, "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base for Institutionalized Racism," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 40, No. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

(2) Charles Valentine, "Deficit, Difference and Bicultural Models of Afro-American Behavior," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 41, No. 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

(3) Ibid.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Baratz, Stephen and Joan. "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 40, No. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. May, 1975.

"Equal Educational Opportunity," Harvard Educational Review. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Frost, Joe L. and Hawkes, Glenn R. The Disadvantaged Child. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970.

Gardner, John W. Self Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Graham, Grace. The Public School in the New Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Kiraraceus, William C., et. al. Negro Self Concept. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Leacock, Eleanor Burke. Teaching and Learning in City Schools: A Comparative Study. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969.

Rogers, Carl R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishers, 1969.

Valentine, Charles A. "Deficit, Difference, and Bicultural Models of Afro-American Behavior," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 41, No. 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

A MULTICULTURAL SCHOOL: LESSONS FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION

Elsa M. Brizzi
University of Southern California

This paper is drawn from an experience in bilingual multi-ethnic education developed in the Allendale School in the Pasadena school district in California. The Allendale school serves 480 students from kindergarten through third grade. The school is in a community which is involved in a complex plan to integrate students from a variety of neighborhoods under one roof. Under this desegregation plan, the school is composed of 38% Caucasian students, with the remainder including Mexican-Americans, Blacks, Asians, Native Americans, Indonesians and others. The school not only represents a range of races and cultural groups but also ranges from the lowest to the highest socio-economic levels within the Pasadena school district. The school staff reflects the ethnicity of the children as well.

The program received financial support under the Bilingual Education Act of 1972, which was originally written and introduced as California Assembly Bill #2284 by Peter Chicone, a Democrat of San Diego. Under this act any district in the state is eligible to apply for funds for bilingual multi-cultural education. The districts which were chosen have large proportions in their school population which are non-English or limited-English speaking. The Pasadena Unified School District is one of the sixty-nine districts in California which received funding under this legislation. The Bilingual Education Act allows public schools in the state to establish bilingual education programs for non-English and limited-English speaking pupils. It is a cooperative effort involving the state and local school districts. Funds from the allocation are used to employ bilingual para-professionals, to purchase materials and provide preservice and ongoing inservice education for the project staffs.

My position in this school was as the Coordinator of Multi-Cultural

Education. As such I had to deal with the variety of problems which were created by the integration of the children into the single school community. Many of the Spanish-speaking students had academic deficits when compared to their English-speaking peers. Although a program existed for teaching children English as a second language, the staff found that they needed to attain much more competence and confidence in languages than they began with. They also needed to increase their multi-ethnic knowledge; they needed new curriculum and instructional materials and to learn how they could use them with this pluralistic group of students. Staff and parents alike needed to acquire second and even third langauge facility as much as did the students. There was a need for bilingual translation in home and school communications.

Most important, the Spanish and English school communities (the two largest "minorities" in our school) felt isolated from one another by language and cultural differences. A group of parents, other community members and professional staff were organized to develop liaisons among segments of the community and provide overall guidance to the educational program of the school. This group attempted to develop an operational philosophy of cultural pluralism. Within this philosophy they developed a framework for multi-ethnic education to prepare their children to live in a multi-cultural and multi-lingual society and to help them develop a feeling of equality of opportunity developed around mutual respect and cross-cultural competence. A curriculum was developed on the assumption that multi-cultural understanding can best be accomplished when the school environment itself radiates pluralism. That is, it communicates pluralism to the children and provides a nurturing climate for each student so he can explore himself in the culture which is most familiar to him and at the same time learn to reach out to persons of cultural and linguistic differences. The staff had relatively low facility in Spanish, although three or four of us were relatively competent in both Spanish and English. We developed the multi-lingual program around para-professionals who worked in the classrooms helping children learn in their original language and acquire a second one, while helping them understand one another's culture. In other words, the school used bilingual para-professionals to provide linguistic competence and to model cultural behaviors for both Spanish and non-Spanish students. The para-professionals needed much training in teaching. The staff needed to learn how to deploy them.

However, the para-professionals provided immediate competence in the multiple languages which were necessary within the school. In addition, many bi-literate community persons were recruited to work without pay with the trained teaching staffs.

The populations of each of the classes in the school were organized to balance the number of children whose primary language was English with those who were not English-speaking. The distribution was determined by assessing the linguistic competence of the students and discussing with the parents their preferences for the types of instruction they would like the children to receive.

The center for bilingual multi-cultural education supports the program in several ways. One of these is to provide materials for the bilingual instructional program. The center was the central repository for curriculum materials, tests, and other evaluation instruments. Second, it provided inservice training to para-professionals and staff, including demonstration classes. Third, it organized community programs to increase the participation of community members in the activities of the school. Thus, the center operated as an inschool community resource center, a center for developing home/school bilingual communications, and provided inservice training to the teachers and para-professionals. Staff development proved to be the key to the Allendale program. A framework for a continuing inservice development process had to be developed which could involve all participants in the program--teachers, paid para-professionals, volunteers, and community members. There were two important dimensions to the program. One of these was to help develop expertise in critical issues in multi-cultural bilingual education. The second was to develop the internal training system, thus utilizing the talents of all staff of the program as needed, including tutoring sessions in which teachers worked with para-professionals and other teachers, and para-professionals worked with teachers and fellow para-professionals. The staff traveled to other bilingual programs to see them operate, to discuss new instructional materials, and to observe outstanding teachers.

Equally important was the "I'll help you; you help me" atmosphere in the center. This cooperative arrangement permitted everyone to be a learner and a contributor at the same time. The belief was that the acceptance, understanding and mutual respect for the contributions of all participants on the professional and para-professional staff would be necessary if

they were to develop that kind of atmosphere for children. The atmosphere of open and nurturing acceptance of all personnel permitted experimentation to go on far more than is usual in the traditional school, lessened the fear of failure on the part of teachers and students, and fostered the ability to openly deal with the normal conflict areas which arise when cultures and languages are brought together. In other words, the group process was as important as the substance which was involved. The center attempted to foster a cooperative group process where teacher and learner roles were interdependent and status and departmental lines and grade lines were merged more readily than is usually the case. The needs of the program, the students, and the staff determined the areas and issues for training rather than the normal status needs.

We believe that a variety of approaches is necessary simultaneously in any kind of multi-cultural bilingual experience. Resources are absolutely critical as well as competence in the various kinds of languages and cultures. If school staff are to be involved in inservice education, they need released time and the opportunity to learn from one another in informal as well as formal settings. Parents need help with baby-sitting, transportation and stipends if they are to participate in the programs. We discovered that there were many persons in the community who had bilingual capability and were interested in being involved in the school program, but who needed to earn money in order to do so. These persons can provide many informal resources which can be used effectively in the school program but which need to be supplemented by curriculum and instructional materials built around multi-cultural and bilingual approaches.

We found that para-professionals could be used in a variety of ways very effectively and could function extremely well to help children understand alternative cultures and to master languages alternative to their own. In addition, they could help children learn <u>in</u> their own native language. However, in order to use para-professionals effectively teachers needed to learn many kinds of things. We found that teachers often were accustomed to organizing their program as if there was to be only one staff member, whereas in a multi-cultural program they needed to be aware of the competencies of the variety of people they were working with and to help them find productive roles inside the classroom setting.

We organized resource units which helped students explore many kinds of cultures, including those which they represented but also including others which they did not. The multi-cultural approach had to be genuinely pluralistic; it could not simply deal with the provincial cultures which were apparent within the school setting itself. It is for this reason that we developed units in which children and teachers studied persons all over the world. In order to initiate the program, teachers needed much more time for program planning and diagnosing the language competence and cultural status of each of the children. No assumptions could be made about anyone, either teachers or students. A careful assessment program had to be developed and it took some time before we developed categories which adequately described the cultural diversity of the community and permitted us to incorporate the strengths and weaknesses of the children and teachers in the program of the school. In addition, a powerful community component had to be developed in order to permit us to help the students explore the cultural resources which were available throughout the community. Thus, we found that, in addition to competence in a variety of languages and cultures, teachers needed to be able to develop a different kind of process inside the classroom and to relate to many community resources. The classroom program provided a significant proportion, but by no means all of the program which was being offered to the children. Teachers had to learn not to be possessive about the instruction that they were providing, but to be grateful for the assistance that they could get from community members and para-professionals.

"IN THIS LAND WHERE ONCE WERE ONLY INDIANS ARE NOW MEN OF EVERY COLOR--WHITE, BLACK, YELLOW, RED--"

AN IN-SERVICE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM AS IT RELATES TO NATIVE AMERICANS

Henrietta V. Whiteman
University of Montana, Missoula

INTRODUCTION

Grandmother Turtle, who carries the weight of the Turtle Island[1] and all its peoples on her back, has further slackened her pace because of the burden of the contemporary mechanized society she is forced to bear. She forlornly asks: "Where are the original peoples I carried on my back? Where is their culture? Where is their way of life? Where are their beliefs?" From the living past come her answers in the ancient oral tradition of the Cheyenne, from the tribal memory of High Chief:

> There are birds of many colors--red, blue, green, yellow--yet it is all one bird. There are horses of many colors--brown, black, yellow, white--yet it is all one horse. So cattle, so all living things--animals, flowers, trees. So men: in this land where once were only Indians are now men of every color--white, black, yellow, red--yet all one people....(2)

This statement expresses the Native American recognition of the concept of diversity--diversity among the winged persons of the air, the four-legged peoples of the earth, and of their brothers and sisters: the animals, flowers, trees, and of man. High Chief not only gives recognition to uniquenesses and individuality, but he also recognizes the unifying bond of humanity. Native Americans have long affirmed a concept of multi-culturalism and multi-tribalism.

The popularly held notion of America as a "great melting pot" does not adequately reflect the Native American perception of multi-culturalism, however. A brief examination of the results of the immigrants' desire for the acquisition of land illustrates one fundamental problem with this confluence

of peoples concept.

Initially, relations between the native peoples and the Anglo-Saxon immigrants were based upon mutual respect. It was not long, however, before the non-Indians' desire for more land considerably altered these relations. The Native American perspective is well illustrated in the words of the Cree patriarch, Speckled Snake.

> Brothers. I have listened to many talks from our Great father. When he first came over the wide waters, he was but a little man...very little. His legs were cramped by sitting long in his big boat, and he begged for a little land to light his fire on.... But when the white man had warmed himself before the Indians' fire and filled himself with their hominy, he became very large. With a step he bestrode the mountains, and his feet covered the plains and the valleys. His hand grasped the eastern and the western sea, and his head rested on the moon....(3)

This giant referred to by Speckled Snake divested the native peoples of this continent of their land so that today "the country once lived in by more than nine million Indians now holds the...descendants in lands reduced by 96%."(4)

The reduction of the Native American land base to a mere four percent of its former size clearly demonstrates the inaccuracy of the melting pot metaphor. There are many other less obvious historical antecedents which contribute to a complex contemporary situation. This lack of understanding and sensitivity for the Native American heritage is reflected in the 1969 Report of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education to Congress. In its "Summary of Historical Findings," it concluded that this is:

> A. A nation that is massively uninformed and misinformed about the American Indian, and his past and present. (and that)
>
> B. Prejudice, racial intolerance, and discrimination towards Indians (are) far more widespread and serious than generally recognized. (5)

This Special Subcommittee specifically addressed the problem of attempting to meld or assimilate cultures without an adequate understanding of those cultures when it stated that:

> The coercive assimilation policy has had disastrous effects on the education of Indian children. It has resulted in:,
>
> A. The classroom and the school becoming a kind of battleground where the Indian child attempts to protect his integrity and identity as an individual

by defeating the purposes of the school.

B. Schools which fail to understand or adapt to, and in fact often denigrate, cultural differences.

C. Schools which blame their own failures on the Indian student and reinforce his defensiveness.

D. Schools which fail to recognize the importance and validity of the Indian community. The community and child retaliate by treating the school as an alien institution.

E. A dismal record of absenteeism, drop-outs, negative self-image, low achievement, and ultimately, academic failure for many Indian children.

F. A perpetuation of the cycle of poverty which undermines the success of all other Federal programs. (6)

This report presents a harsh indictment of many of our school practices or lack of them with respect to the Native American. Without belabouring the point, there is much yet to be done if schools are to more responsibly relate to the Native American. Critical to improved school practice is improved teacher training, and it is toward this latter goal that the remainder of this paper addresses itself.(7)

ESSENTIAL TEACHER COMPETENCIES IN AN IN-SERVICE MULTI-CULTURAL TRAINING PROGRAM

A review of the current literature on teacher education finds two recurring themes: multi-cultural education and competency-based teacher education. Both of these concepts are integrated in outlining programs for the in-service training of the American school teacher relative to the Native American. In-service training emphasizing multi-cultural education can be minimal in its effects on teachers in comparison to the life-long formation of such attitudes. Therefore, fairly comprehensive competency-based programs must be developed if the teacher in turn is to be effective in implementing a multi-cultural program in his/her classroom. It must be noted that regardless of the scope or sophistication of the program, unless the teacher is open to new or modified attitudes, little change will result. The overriding attitude necessary is a basic respect for the Native American heritage and a corollary respect for the Native American person today. This attitude can be fostered in the first competency--outlined below for the in-service teacher.

NATIVE AMERICAN TEACHER COMPETENCY NUMBER ONE: A teacher must develop a respect for Native American cultures. This respect is furthered by the following:

(1) Understanding Native American cultures on this continent prior to Anglo-European contact.

(2) (Understanding that) Indians have been here for thousands of years (and that) this is their homeland.

(3) (Understanding that) they evolved their own distinctive cultures, and did not share the points of view, attitudes, and thinking that came to the rest of the American population from Judeo-Christian, and Western Civilization legacies.

(4) (Understanding that) although the Indians were conquered militarily (and are the only portion of the American population that reflects that experience), they are confirming (a) lesson of history, ...that no people has ever been coerced by another people into scuttling its own culture.

(5) (Understanding that) although acculturation and assimilation do occur, they occur only on the individual's own terms. (8)

This first competency focuses upon teachers' attitudes toward Native Americans. An understanding of the distinctive cultures which have evolved allows for a rich and diverse history to select from. An expanded knowledge base can be acquired through a variety of experiences, not the least of which is first-hand observation and participation. Eliminating the stereotypic thinking which has resulted in the findings reported in the 1969 Subcommittee report on Indian Education will be a complex challenge. Attitudinal modification is a very complicated, time consuming, and often frustrating activity. There are obvious differences in teachers' readiness for such change. For example, before an individual can or will change his/her behavior or attitudes, he/she must perceive a need to change. It is assumed that the extent of one's knowledge is related to the degree to which one perceives a problem or a need. A knowledge base upon which to reflect and react is needed and this knowledge base will vary considerably from teacher to teacher. This first competency outlines basic areas for eliminating stereotypical thinking as it relates to the American Indian.

NATIVE AMERICAN TEACHER COMPETENCY NUMBER TWO: A teacher must recognize and communicate to his/her students the fact that American society is culturally heterogeneous and that cultural differences are strengths rather than weaknesses. The teacher must recognize and communicate to his/her students the fact that Native American society is also culturally heterogeneous or multitribal.

The ability to do this is of primary importance while the notion of the "melting pot" is still in use. Our society has tended to distort the

concept of cultural diversity and to concentrate its educational efforts rather in the direction of an unrealistic mono-cultural view of reality. Too often in this view, all cultures, other than those referred to as "American," carried some stigma. The reality is that the United States of America is a land of diverse cultures. Thus educational institutions, which are a microcosm of the larger world, often reflect this heterogeneity in their student bodies. This diversity should not be reflected only in the student, but also in the curriculum of the school. Multi-cultural education which is dedicated to the recognition and legitimatization of cultural pluralism is needed now at all levels of education. The emphasis must be on the positive aspects of our cultural differences. This is necessary to cultivate a sense of human dignity and worth for every student and teacher.

It is equally important that every classroom recognize that the group commonly referred to as Native American is comprised of culturally distinct tribes, each possessing its own way of life, traditions, language, and history. Dr. Louise Miller, a member of the Yurok Tribe of California, speaks to the implications of this concept:

> ...it must be remembered that one of the fallacies and the basic underlying assumption of Indian education has been to lump the needs of all Native Americans into one global definition. Rather it must be understood that each Indian tribal group has its own language, its own economics, its own philosophy, its own psychology, its own religious base, and its own history of origin. These components inextricably become the base of any particular tribal culture. (9)

The classroom teacher who works with Native Americans should have extensive knowledge of local tribal group culture(s). In addition, the teacher should demonstrate a general knowledge of the cultural and linguistic differences prevalent between that tribe and other Native American tribes. He or she should be able to explain differences between tribal customs, the reservation system, and Native Americans as contemporary citizens wherever they are located. According to attorney and author Vine Deloria, Jr., a Standing Rock Sioux,

> ...there are some 315 Indian tribal groups in 26 states still functioning as quasi-sovereign nations under treaty status; they range from the mammoth Navajo tribe of some 132,000 with 16 million acres of land to tiny Mission Creek of California with 15 people and a tiny parcel of property. There are over half a million Indians in the cities alone, with the largest concentrations in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Minneapolis and Chicago. (10)

In summary, the teacher must develop a sensitivity to and respect for cultural heterogeneity, and in the same context recognize the tribal heterogeneity of Native Americans. The primary attitude that must be developed by the teacher is that cultural differences do not imply superiority or inferiority. The primary competence to be instilled is a more accurate understanding of these differences.

NATIVE AMERICAN TEACHER COMPETENCY NUMBER THREE: A teacher must be able to identify resources, both human and material, contemporary and historical, relating to local tribal culture(s) and integrate them into the classroom situation.

American education has an historical pattern of excluding those parents and/or community members who are culturally different from children in the classroom. The lack of knowledge and understanding about these people has led to ingrained biases, racial intolerance, and prejudice. Unfortunately, this selective practice of the societal majority causes those whose cultures are different to view the education system as an alien institution. Morgan Otis, Kiowa-Arapaho university professor, comments on this situation:

> In effect, the Indian has rejected the American educational system because it first rejected him: Indians have desired education, but within a system that includes the home and the community in the education process. It is through this process that Indian children learn their tribal language, custom, tradition, religion, and philosophy. (11)

The traditional familial and communal customs of Native American education underscore the need for close relationships between school personnel and Native American community. Not only must the family and community be involved in school activities, but the members of the school community must become more involved in the community. This ability of teachers to interact with the local community has been identified by Hopi educator Milo Kalectaca as a primary competency for teachers. He states:

> A competent teacher of an Indian Community...should be able to--
>
> 1. describe the geography, home life, and economics of that Indian community;
> 2. describe the services offered by the various community agencies active in the school community; and
> 3. discuss the tribal government and name and describe the responsibilities of the officials. (12)

Additionally Mr. Kalectaca defines a competent teacher as one who has knowledge concerning the language, value system, religion, and education of the local Indian community and can discuss these with the children in a non-biased manner.

The teacher should be able to identify appropriate individuals to utilize as resource persons in the classroom. An obvious resource would be the tribal elders. They generally have a wealth of knowledge regarding their respective culture(s) that they could share with the younger members of the community. Other resource persons might be community members who have special knowledge of how the local tribal government operates and its relationship to the federal government and still others might be those who have information on contemporary economic, sociological and political characteristics of the local tribal culture(s). The teacher must not only involve tribal elders and community members in the classroom setting, but must make a concerted effort to involve family members of the students as well. Because parental involvement is the primary ingredient to a successful school system, it is incumbent upon the classroom teacher to solicit and welcome parental participation.

Once a teacher establishes communication with the community, it becomes that teacher's responsibility to develop relevant curricular materials that the parents and/or community believe should be taught in the classroom. The curricular materials could focus upon cultural aspects of the local tribal specific group(s), or upon historical and contemporary aspects of life. In developing curricular materials, the teacher should carefully document not only historical information, but information of a contemporary nature as well. Too often the Native American is presented as a relic, an object from America's past. Little mention is made of the fact that he or she is a functioning, contributing contemporary citizen of this country.

In summary, a teacher must develop the competency to interact with parents and community members not only in the school environment, but in the community as well. Such interaction will make identification of necessary human and curricular resources a less formidable task. It is incumbent upon the teacher to continually utilize such resources in the classroom.

NATIVE AMERICAN TEACHER COMPETENCY NUMBER FOUR: A teacher must develop the competency to utilize and present curricular materials and information about Native Americans without bias. He or she should be knowledgeable about the

vast contributions Native Americans have made and are continuing to make in present day American society.

A competent teacher must develop the ability to utilize Native American curricular materials accurately and objectively. This specific competency is especially critical in the area of history. As Virgil J. Vogel states, "American history textbooks are now being justly criticized for their lack of attention to, or distorted treatment of, the role of ethnic minorities..."[13] Teachers must rigorously examine historical accounts and interpret history from the standpoint of the Native American and other minorities as well as from the majority perspective. Based upon such misconceptions and distortions, American Indians are justly critical of "the manner in which Indians are treated in textbooks--one of the most powerful means by which our society transmits ideas from generation to generation..."[14] As early as December 1, 1927, the Grand Council Fire of American Indians addressed the mayor of Chicago with these words:

> We do not know if school histories are pro-British, but we do know that they are unjust to the life of our people--the American Indian. They call all white victories, battles, and all Indian victories, massacres. The battle with Custer has been taught to school children as a fearful massacre on our part. We ask that this, as well as other incidents, be told fairly. If the Custer battle was a massacre, what was Wounded Knee? (15)

The necessary historical reorientation that must occur requires a teacher with an open mind and considerable enthusiasm for collecting materials. This body of material presenting the point of view of the American Indian must be integrated into existing courses, and can be presented as well in specially designed American Indian history courses. The average American history teacher must rely upon such supplementary information until less stereotypic textbooks are written and adopted for use. To date, history textbooks have been imbalanced and one-sided.

Existing history texts not only omit Native American historical contributions, but they also omit Native American contemporary contributions to American society. Native Americans' contributions to their homeland are extensive, particularly in the area of medicine. These contributions have become a part of the American tradition. Unfortunately, the origins of many of the life-sustaining products and democratic ideals have been lost in the "melting pot."

> Much of what we are, our greatness, comes from the Indian; not just the land, but our agricultural products, many of our medical practices, and some of our most cherished political traditions. Corn and potatoes, peanuts, squash, peppers, tobacco, avocados--these were cultivated by the Indian long before the white man's arrival. Many of America's contributions to medical science, until the last few decades, dated back to the Indians--quinine, cocaine, witch hazel, petroleum jelly. (16)

Native American contributions obviously have not been limited to the past. Many, many illustrious Americans are of Indian descent. The following list comes readily to mind:

> N. Scott Momaday (Kiowa), Pulitzer-winning Novelist
> Maria Tallchief (Osage), Ballerina
> Buffy St. Marie (Cree), Folksinger
> Louis Ballard (Quapah-Cherokee), Composer
> A. Whiteman (Cheyenne-Arapaho), Artist
> Vine Deloria, Jr. (Standing Rock Sioux), Attorney and Author
> LaDonna Harris (Comanche), Administratrix
> Morris Thompson (Athapascan), Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs
> William Demmert (Tlingit), Commissioner, Office of Indian Education
> Gary Niles Kimble (Gros Ventre),State Legislator, Attorney, Professor

From this list alone it is apparent that Native Americans are still sharing their beauty of life--oratory, dance, music, art--and their experience in statesmanship with America.

In summary, teachers must develop the competency to teach Native American course content factually and objectively. This is particularly true in the area of history where it is the responsibility of the teacher to present a total perspective of America. Experiences can become balanced for students if a teacher is knowledgeable of the best contributions Native Americans have made and continue to make to society. In presenting this perspective, a teacher can help promote positive self-concepts among Native American students, erode stereotypes, and begin the process of breaking down racial intolerance and building up respect for culturally different life styles.

NATIVE AMERICAN TEACHER COMPETENCY NUMBER FIVE: A Native American teacher should have knowledge of the vast linguistic differences among tribal Native Americans, and develop a competency in the home language of the American Indian children he or she works with.

A teacher should understand that there are vast linguistic differences among tribal Native Americans. Native Americans are not only multi-

tribal, but they are also multi-lingual. This diversity among tribes is particularly apparent when one examines the language spoken by specific tribes since there is no universal Indian language. An American Indian, if he or she speaks his or her language, specifies with a tribal name what language this is, such as: Navajo, Blackfeet, Cree, Salish, Shoshone, Hopi, Cheyenne. It has been estimated that two hundred tribal-specific languages exist today. Some Native Americans speak only their native language, others speak English only, and yet others may be bilingual, speaking both their native language and English.

A native language is a basic component of any culture and a primary means through which that culture is reinforced. This concept of language is explained by Patricia Locke, an educator from the White Earth Chippewa and Hunkpapa Sioux tribes:

> Indian languages should be taught and reinforced whenever possible. Language reinforces the traditional and evolving cultures of our people. The words and meanings of those words are the key to survival for Indian people because they reflect the philosophy and world view of the particular tribe. Language is our window to the worlds. (17)

It must be understood that native words involve concepts, many of which are untranslatable into English words. For example, the English language has words denoting different nationalities of peoples, as well as denoting tribes of American Indians. Native tribes also have words for different races, but they may involve cultural concepts that are difficult, if not impossible, to convey in the English language. To illustrate this point, the Cheyenne call the white race wi?ho?, which also means "spider." George Bird Grinnell explains the use of this word from the non-Indian perspective as:

> Wihio...appears to embody the idea of mental ability of an order higher than common--superior intelligence...To the Indian the white man appears superior in intelligence to other men. He has great knowledge, wonderful implements, and clever ways. When he came, he knew more than the Indians, and taught them how to do things they had never done before, or, indeed, had ever thought of doing. On account of his ability they called him wihio. The spider spins a web, and goes up and down, seemingly walking on nothing. It is more able than other insects; hence its name. (18)

Southern Cheyenne tribal memory offers a different explanation from that of

Mr. Grinnell. The Cheyenne perspective is that wi?ho? implies cunning or deceit like the spider, who spins an invisible web to capture its victims. The Cheyennes knew from a prophecy that the white man would come to this country, and they knew how he would act. After the Cheyenne saw he acted as prophesied, they called him wi?ho?. He was named for the spider, as he victimized the Cheyenne by spinning an intricate web of life around him. The Cheyenne say they can see his web today in the barbed wire fences he has put on the face of their Mother Earth. According to the Cheyenne, they are not the only tribe to call the white man spider; so do the Arapaho.

Linguistic and cultural concepts come into play, then, that are unexplainable in English and in fact alien to English thought processes and patterns. Conversely, the classroom teacher must understand that English language and English thought processes may be alien to a student if English is the student's second language or if the student speaks only his or her native language. Competency in native language is necessary and mandated by law as a result of the 1974 decision of the Lau v. Nichols case (414 U.S. 563), which requires instruction in the native language of the student(s).[19] In light of this Federal Court decision, it is imperative that the teacher of the Native American student can provide classroom instruction in the home language of the student(s). Culture, diversity, and integrity are thus reinforced, and the concept of multi-cultural education will be better integrated into the educational systems of America.

GUIDELINES FOR DESIGNING AN IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

It would be misleading to imply that a teacher need only master five competencies related to the teaching of or about Native Americans. These five competencies are but the base from which a teacher is expected to build. These broad competencies must be further defined and more specific knowledge and skill areas identified for continuous professional development. They serve as a core from which to build more specific competencies appropriate to the unique needs emanating from the heterogeneity of Native American tribes, culturally and geographically. For example, it would be presumptuous for a Cheyenne to design a teacher inservice training program for teachers of Hopi children because of the disparity of the two groups' cultural experiences and orientations. The specific teacher competencies that must be further defined for development by teachers depend upon the specific situation. How knowledgeable and skilled

a teacher should be is contingent upon how closely the teacher works with the Native American community.

A cardinal rule of any inservice teacher training program is interaction and planning with the Native American community. This should be the initial step. It should be approached not as a difficult responsibility for school personnel but rather as an advantage--a resource to the school community. Expertise pertinent to local tribal groups must come from local communities. Expertise regarding other tribes must come from the Native American community-at-large. Mechanisms for retaining information on individuals with expertise must be developed, not only for the current inservice training program itself but also for future reference. A Native American resource bank should be generated. Not until these resources have been identified can the format for a training program be adequately developed.

A requisite of the training program is that all activities be oriented, as much as possible, toward achieving maximum involvement of the teacher. Training sessions should include teachers in activities rather than perpetuate previous roles in other inservice teacher education programs as detached observers. One type of involvement which should be achieved is observing Native American students being taught in classes in which the curriculum reflects the students' cultural backgrounds. Teachers can build confidence in themselves by observing effective multi-cultural education. The inservice training program could also assume the form of a college or university seminar utilizing a lecture-discussion-type approach but one where the instructor relies heavily upon local community persons to provide pertinent cultural, historical, and contemporary materials.

This strategy places the financial burden on the teachers themselves. Another strategy would be to have a joint body of the school and Native American community approach the State Department of Public Instruction, Indian education component. In this way it may be possible that funds can be procured for statewide inservice teacher training programs as they relate to Native Americans. Yet another method which might be explored is that of the local school and Native American communities working with a tribal education committee. In this procedure the tribe would control the funding but be responsible for providing the necessary resources. This alternative appears to be viable especially in view of funds currently available to tribal entities

under the Indian Education Act.

These alternatives, however, should be viewed as temporary measures that hopefully are more responsive than many current practices. Considerable thought and planning should go into a more comprehensive and cohesive plan for the long range training of teachers in this area. This type of planning would identify regional centers where data banks and training programs could be housed to reflect the unique needs of each region. These would be developed in consort with the tribes and would reflect cultural and linguistic differences, tribal histories and contemporary information on each tribe's activities.

In conclusion ,the Native American student must be treated for who he/she is. To do otherwise is to behave insensitively by denying the existence of the Native American identity. The Native American student must no longer be the victim of racially biased history. Teachers' training must be integrated with Native American studies. Such study is actually

> ...integral to the education of any individual who lives in this pluralistic society. The respect for our brother's vision can only come with understanding that this great Turtle Continent was founded upon diversity of cultures, even prior to Anglo-European contact. Education must have meaning for all the diverse peoples of this nation, and failure to recognize this reality has resulted in situations such as the student strikes at the University of California, Berkeley; the disturbances at Kent State; the riots in Watts; and the final debacle at My Lai. (20)

America must recognize that its greatness comes from its diversity, and that the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant ethic of assimilating all peoples into a homogenous cultural "melting pot" is a myth. The mesmerized Native American tribes have awakened to a new era of cultural enlightenment and a renewed sense of cultural integrity. As High Chief verbalized, "...in this land where once were only Indians are now men of every color--white, black, yellow, red..."(21) Each of these is endowed with inalienable rights to his cultural heritages--heritages that can be maintained through competent teachers and dedication to the concept of multi-cultural and multi-tribal education.

REFERENCE NOTES

(1) Southern Cheyenne oral tradition records the formation of this continent on the back of Grandmother Turtle; consequently, this continent is referred to as the Turtle Island.

(2) E. Russell Carter, The Gift is Rich (New York: Friendship Press, 1968), pp. 80-81.

(3) T. C. McLuhan, Touch the Earth: A Self-Portrait of Indian Existence (New York: Outerbridge & Dienstfrey, 1971), p. 73.

(4) Robert L. Iacopi (ed.), Look to the Mountain Top (San Jose, California: Gousha Publications, 1972), p. 93.

(5) United States Senate, Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge, 91st Congress, 1st Session, November 3, 1969 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 21.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid., p. 200.

(8) William A. Hunter (ed.), Multicultural Education Through Competency-Based Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974), p. 233.

(9) Alvin M. Josephy, Jr., Red Power: The American Indians; Fight for Freedom (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 236.

(10) Cultural materials are those relating to the five components of culture as defined in the documentary "Cultural Conflict and Traditional Curricula" filmed by the University of New Mexico. The five components are: 1) language, 2) foods--diet, 3) dress and adornments--costuming, 4) values and beliefs--ethics, and 5) social patterns.

(11) Jeannette Henry (ed.), The American Indian Reader: Education (San Francisco: The Indian Historian Press, Inc., 1972), p. 72, quoting F. McKinley and M. Otis, "The Basic Program Plan of the Multi-Ethnic Education Program" (Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1970) p. 5. (Unpublished)

(12) Hunter, pp. 220-21.

(13) Virgil J. Vogel, This Country Was Ours: A Documentary History of the American Indian (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972), p. xxvii.

(14) United States Senate (1969 Report), p. 23.

(15) Rupert Costo (ed.) and Jeannette Henry (writer), Textbooks and the American Indian (San Francisco: The Indian Historian Press, Inc., 1970), p. 2.

(16) Edgar S. Cahn (ed.), Our Brother's Keeper: The Indian in White America (New York: New Community Press, 1969), p. 178.

(17) Patricia Locke, "Theoretical Construct of the Ideal School System for American Indians...Kindergarten through Life," in Position Papers, Native American Teacher Corps Conference, Denver, Colorado, April 26-29, 1973 (Billings, Montana: Eastern Montana College), Vol. I, p. 7.

(18) George Bird Grinnell, The Cheyenne Indians: Their History and Ways of Life (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972), Vol. II, pp. 88-89.

(19) Hunter, p. 43.

(20) Henrietta Whiteman, "A Vision: The Warrior-Scholar-Community Activist, The End Product of Indian Studies," in Vine Deloria, Jr. (ed.), Indian Education Confronts the Seventies (Oglala, South Dakota and Tasile, Arizona: American Indian Resource Associates and Navajo Community College, 1974), Vol. III, p. 21.

(21) Carter, loc. cit.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER CORPS RECRUITMENT AND TECHNICAL RESOURCE CENTERS

Western RTR Center
William C. Hill, Director
University of Southern California
311 South Spring
Los Angeles, California 90015
(213) 625-7204

Midwestern RTR Center
Floyd T. Waterman, Director
University of Nebraska
Center for Urban Education
3805 North 16th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68110
(402) 554-2773

Great Lakes RTR Center
Barbara A. Vance, Director
Wayne State University
2978 W. Grand Boulevard, 2nd floor
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(313) 577-1618

Northeastern RTR Center
Donald W. Parker, Director
Howard University
1411 K Street, N.W., Suite 420
Washington, D. C. 20005
(202) 737-7868

Southeastern RTR Center
Michael G. Baker, Director
University of Georgia
337 South Milledge Avenue, Room 209
Athens, Georgia 30601
(404) 542-5862

Chief of Center Operations:

Velma Robinson
Teacher Corps
U. S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
(202) 245-8275

APPENDIX B

PROJECT CONSULTANT INTERVIEWERS

Ursula Anderson	Midwestern RTR Center
Roxie Bagley	Western RTR Center
Michael Baker	Southeastern RTR Center
Wilbert Bledsoe	Great Lakes RTR Center
James Boyer	Kansas State University
Elsa Brizzi	University of Southern California
Carol Bryant	Wayne County Junior College, Detroit
Roger G. Bryant	Southeastern RTR Center
Ronald Butler	Carroll County, Georgia School System
Francine Clemons	Washington, D. C. Public Schools
Paul Collins	New York Teacher Corps Network
Suzie Collins	Pasadena Unified School District
Carol Coy	Northeastern RTR Center
Joyce Ellis	Boston Indian Council
Floyd Falany	Reinhart College
Paul Fisher	University of Southern California
Eugene George	University of South Carolina
Eileen Goins	University of Seattle
Turner Goodlow	Houston Independent School District
John Green	University of South Alabama
Marilyn Harper	Stanford University
Edith Harrison	Portland COP Project
William C. Hill	Western RTR Center
Willie Hodge	University of Toledo
Janet Hunter	Compton Unified School District
Andrew Johnson	Wayne State University
Bruce Joyce	Stanford University
Mary Kelley	Consultant, Worcester, Mass.
Hal Knight	West Virginia Institute
Margaret Koch	Pasadena Unified School District

Reba Lassiter	Pasadena Unified School District
Billie Lipsey	Detroit Public Schools
Mary Logan	Federal City College
Patricia Matthews	Northeastern RTR Center
Donald Mims	Los Angeles City Schools
Barbara Ogletree	Southeastern RTR Center
Roger Pankratz	Western Kentucky University
Donald Parker	Northeastern RTR Center
Lucy Peck	Hofstra University
Lorenzo Reid	Consultant, Washington, D. C.
Terry Rice	Stanford University
Joseph Romo	Western RTR Center
Richard Stroup	Costa Mesa School District
Beulah Tumpkin	Consultant, Detroit
Rupert Trujillo	University of New Mexico
Barbara Vance	Great Lakes RTR Center
Susan Vernand	Pasadena Unified School District
Floyd Waterman	Midwestern RTR Center
Doris Wilson	Southeastern RTR Center
James Wilson	Wayne State University
Roger Wilson	Northern Arizona University